DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 104 200 HE 006 315

TITLE	Perspectives and Plans for Graduate Studies. 15. History 1974.
INSTITUTION	Ontario Council on Graduate Studies, Toronto. Advisory Committee on Academic Planning.
PUB DATE	75
NOTE	224p.
AVAILABLE FROM	Council of Ontario Universities, 130 St. George Street, Suite 8039, Toronto, Ontario M5S 2T4 ($5.00)
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.76 HC-$10.78 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS	Admission (School); Educational Planning; Enrollment Trends; *Foreign Countries; Graduate Students; *Graduate Study; *Higher Education; *History; *History Instruction; Program Evaluation; Universities
IDENTIFIERS	Canada; *Universities of Ontario

ABSTRACT

This document examines graduate studies in the history departments of the universities of Ontario. Emphasis is placed on the present state of affairs in relation to: faculty, graduate students, master's programs, Ph.D. programs, cooperation, and libraries and archives, immediate developments, and the future. A summary of the recommendations indicate that the consultants: (1) approve all existing MA and Ph.D. programs; (2) recommend the funding of the MA program at Laurentian, and of the Ph.D. programs at Carleton and Waterloo; (3) propose a major reorganization of work for the Ph.D.; (4) favor the MA by dissertation; (5) recommend the virtual cessation of part-time study for the Ph.D. and a close control over part-time MAs; (6) recommend that a much larger part of the faculty be involved in graduate teaching; (7) recommend no limitation on admissions and would like to see a model expansion of student numbers; (8) recommend that more aspects and areas of history be studied at the Ph.D. level, especially those not covered at Toronto; (9) would like to see more intensive work in local history; (10) recommend setting up more advanced research seminars; (11) look for greater cooperation between history departments and historians in other departments; (12) recommend joint programs run by several universities; and (13) advise history Ph.D. to seek more employment outside universities. Other recommendations and supplementary material are presented. (MJM)

ED104200

Council of Ontario Universities

Conseil des Universités de l'Ontario

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

PERSPECTIVES AND PLANS FOR GRADUATE STUDIES

15. HISTORY 1974*

HE 006 315

Advisory Committee on Academic Planning
Ontario Council on Graduate Studies

75-2

*The status of this report is given in Item 2 of the statement of principles, on page 1.

PERSPECTIVES AND PLANS FOR GRADUATE STUDIES

Reports in Print (February, 1975)	Price
1. Library Science 1972	$5.00
2. Education 1973	5.00
3. Economics 1973	5.00
4. Geography 1973	5.00
5. Chemistry 1973	5.00
6. Solid Earth Science 1973	5.00
7. Sociology 1973	5.00
8. Anthropology 1974	3.00
9. Political Science 1974	5.00
10. Physical Education 1974	5.00
11. Engineering 1974	
A. Chemical Engineering	5.00
B. Electrical Engineering	5.00
C. Metallurgical and Materials Engineering	5.00
D. Mechanical Engineering	5.00
E. Industrial Engineering and Systems Design	5.00
12. Religious Studies 1974	5.00
13. Planning and Environmental Studies 1974	5.00
14. Physics and Astronomy 1974	5.00
15. History 1974	5.00

Reports in Preparation (February, 1975)

11. Engineering 1974
    F. Civil Engineering
16. Biophysics 1974
17. Administration, Business and Management Science 1974

Copies of reports in this series may be ordered from:

Council of Ontario Universities,
130 St. George Street,
Suite 8039,
Toronto, Ontario M5S 2T4

Please make cheque payable to:

COU Holdings Limited

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Page
FOREWORD		i-ii
REPORT AND RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE COUNCIL OF ONTARIO UNIVERSITIES		1-5
REPORT OF ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC PLANNING		1-22
APPENDICES		
Appendix A:	Report of Consultants	A1-A97
Appendix B:	Response of the Discipline Group	B1-B4
Appendix C:	University Comments	C1-C48
Appendix D:	Procedure of Planning Study and Terms of Reference	D1-D6
Appendix E:	Discipline Group Membership	E1
Appendix F:	Roles of ACAP and of Discipline Groups	F1-F4
Appendix G:	Curricula Vitarum of the Consultants	G1-G3
Appendix H:	Addendum to Consultants' Report	H1-H15

FOREWORD

The Advisory Committee on Academic Planning (ACAP), as presently constituted, was established by the Ontario Council on Graduate Studies at the request of the Council of Ontario Universities in January, 1971. The Advisory Committee's terms of reference were directed broadly toward the effective planning and rationalization of long-term graduate development in Ontario's universities both at the level of individual disciplines and at a more general level. The Advisory Committee's activities are based on the premise that graduate work is the one area of university activity in which specialization among universities, cooperative arrangements and comprehensive planning are most necessary.

In March, 1971, concern over the rising costs for support of graduate work prompted the Ontario government to institute a general embargo on funding for any new graduate programme, that is, one which had no students enrolled on May 1, 1971. This embargo was subsequently modified to include only those disciplines in which over-expansion was felt to be potentially most serious. ACAP was to begin immediately planning studies in those disciplines which remained embargoed.

The disciplinary planning process begins with the formation of a discipline group composed of one representative from each university with an interest in graduate work in the planning area. The discipline group assists in defining the precise academic boundaries of each study, scrutinizes the data collection forms, prepares a list of potential consultants, maintains contact with the consultants during the study, and prepares a commentary on the consultants' report.

The final decision on consultants for the planning study is made by ACAP. The consultants are requested to make recommendations on programmes to be offered in Ontario, desirable and/or likely enrolments, the division of responsibility for programmes among universities, and the desirable extent of collaboration with related disciplines.

While the consultants' report is the single largest element in the final report on the planning study, ACAP considers the statement of each university's forward plans to be most significant. These forward plans are usually outlined prior to the planning study, and are used as a basis for comments from the universities concerned on the consultants' report.

On receipt of the consultants' report, and comments on it from the discipline group and the universities, ACAP begins work on its own recommendations for submission directly to the Council of Ontario Universities. COU considers the input from all sources, and prepares the position of the Ontario university community.

The following report is one of a series of disciplinary planning studies carried out by the Advisory Committee on Academic Planning and to be published by the Council of Ontario Universities. The emphasis of the report is on forward planning, and it is hoped that the implementation of COU's recommendations will help to ensure the more ordered growth and development of graduate studies in Ontario's universities.

Council of Ontario Universities
Conseil des Universités de l'Ontario

Report and Recommendations concerning Graduate Studies in History

On the instruction of the Council of Ontario Universities, the Advisory Committee on Academic Planning has conducted a planning assessment for history. The resultant report from ACAP is attached together with the consultants' report, the comments by the discipline group, and the comments of the individual universities. The procedures followed and the planning techniques used are described in the ACAP report and are not repeated here. It is important for the reader to read the ACAP report and attachments in order to understand the recommendations in this Report from COU.

The Council received the ACAP report and supporting documentation on October 3, 1974. The ACAP report was discussed on that occasion and on December 5, 1974.

As a result of these discussions this Report and Recommendations were prepared and approved by the Council on January 10, 1975. The Report is addressed to the Ontario Council on University Affairs and the universities of Ontario.

The following principles have been adopted and will apply to this and all other COU Reports arising out of assessments.

1. Discipline assessments by ACAP should form the basis for planning by the universities of their development of graduate studies, particularly PhD programmes. On the basis of these assessments, COU should make its own recommendations on currently embargoed programmes. Each university must retain the freedom and responsibility to plan and implement its own academic development. However, the universities in embarking on a cooperative planning process have signalled their intentions of cooperating with the COU recommendations.

2. Universities generally plan their emphases in graduate study on the bases of related departments, not of single departments. Initially the sequential nature of the discipline planning assessments made this difficult. However, by the summer of 1974 assessments of most of the social sciences, all of the physical sciences, engineering doctoral work, and a number of professional areas were completed. On the information and recommendations available, each university should be able to make decisions concerning its support of graduate programmes in these areas. Amendments to university responses to the individual discipline planning assessments may then be made in the wider context of a group of related disciplines and amendments to COU's original Reports on an individual discipline may be required.

3. The first concern in planning is to review the quality of graduate opportunities and of students in Ontario universities and to make judgements about how to proceed or not proceed based on quality considerations. The procedures have made use of highly qualified independent consultants who have no direct interest in the universities in Ontario. Accordingly, COU feels bound to accept their judgements about quality where they are stated clearly unless unconvinced that their conclusions about quality are consistent with their evidence. COU's recommendations in the case of programmes which are of unsatisfactory or questionable quality will call for discontinuation or the carrying out of an appraisal, if the continuation of the programme is not crucial to the province's offerings. In some cases, however, there may be a particular need for the programme and the appropriate recommendation will be to strengthen it, with an appraisal following that action. It is also possible that if there were found to be too large a number of broadly based programmes there could be a recommendation to discontinue the weakest; in this case, an appraisal for a more limited programme might be relevant.

4. A second consideration is the scope of opportunities for graduate work in the discipline. Do the Ontario programmes together offer a satisfactory coverage of the main divisions of the disciplines?

5. Numbers of students to be planned for will depend on the likely number of applicants of high quality and in some cases may relate to an estimate of society's needs. Such estimates may be reasonably reliable in some cases and not in others. If the plans of the universities appear to be consistent with the likely number of well-qualified applicants and there is either no satisfactory basis for estimating needs or there is no inconsistency between a reasonable estimate of need and the universities' plans, then COU will take note of the facts without making recommendations on the subject of numbers.

   If the numbers being planned for by the universities are grossly out of line with the anticipated total of well-qualified students, or a reliable estimate of needs, COU will make appropriate corrective recommendations. Depending on the circumstances, these may call for a change in the total numbers to be planned for and indications of which institutions should increase, decrease, or discontinue. The recommendations in serious cases may need to specify departmental figures for each university for a time. If the numbers being planned for are insufficient, the recommendations may call for expansion, or new programmes, and may have implications for both operating and capital costs.

   Unless there are exceptional circumstances, the recommendations concerning enrolment will not call for a university to refuse admission to any well-qualified student who wishes to work in a

field in which that university offers a programme and in which it has the capacity to accommodate the student.

6. The quality of graduate programmes is partly dependent on size, and for each programme, depending on how it is designed and its scope, there is a minimum size of enrolment below which quality may suffer. That number cannot be expressed for the discipline as a whole but only for individual programmes depending on their purpose, their resources and their design.

7. Universities will be expected to notify COU if they intend to depart from the COU Report in any way which they believe might have a significant bearing on the provincial plans.

8. Appraisals arising as the result of assessments are to be based on the standards but not necessarily the scope of the acceptable programmes in the province.

General Observations concerning History

1. Generally, graduate work in history in the province is of good quality and the standard of faculty well above average.

2. Three universities are designated with general doctoral programmes and six with a more specialized role at the doctoral level. Fourteen of the universities have master's programmes.

3. Certain areas for doctoral work need more attention, in particular the history of third world countries.

4. As yet there does not appear to be a mismatch between the number of new PhDs in history and academic employment. However, in the future, vacancies are likely to be few and potential students should be aware of the employment climate and the probable need to explore non-academic markets.

5. The length of time taken to obtain the PhD degree and the number of students in the ABD category are excessive.

6. It is essential to maintain the growth of library resources in history. The development of acquisition policies coordinated through the university system is to be encouraged.

Recommendations

It is recommended that:

1. The universities examine the structure of the PhD requirements and consider steps that would encourage graduate students to remain at university until they complete the thesis.

2. Queen's University continue to offer a masters' programme according to its plans and a general doctoral programme in history.

3. The University of Toronto continue to offer a master's programme in history according to its plans and a general doctoral programme in history.

4. York University continue to offer a master's programme according to its plans and a general doctoral programme in history.

5. Carleton University continue to offer a master's programme according to its plans and a specialized doctoral programme in Canadian history.

6. The University of Ottawa continue to offer a master's programme according to its plans and a specialized doctoral programme in the history of New France and France under the Ancien Régime and the history of French Canada.

7. The University of Guelph continue to offer a master's programme according to its plans and submit a detailed report to ACAP on its future plans soon after the completion of the current review by the Appraisals Committee. ACAP then would make recommendations concerning the role of Guelph in doctoral work in history. In any case a progress report is requested by June 1975.

8. McMaster University continue to offer a master's programme according to its plans and a specialized doctoral programme in ancient history (Greek and Roman), Canadian history and modern British history (including Imperial and Commonwealth history).

9. The University of Waterloo continue to offer a master's programme according to its plans and a specialized doctoral programme in European history since the Reformation, early modern and modern British history and the history of the British Possessions in the Atlantic area, and the history of Canada and the United States.

10. The University of Western Ontario continue to offer a master's programme according to its plans and a specialized doctoral programme in Canadian history, with some modest offerings in American and British history, and with an increased emphasis to social-structural and demographic history.

11. Lakehead University continue to offer a master's programme in history according to its approved Five-Year Plan.

12. Laurentian University continue to offer a master's programme in history according to its approved Five-Year Plan.

13. Trent University continue to offer a master's programme in history according to its approved Five-Year Plan.

14. Wilfrid Laurier University continue to offer a master's programme in history according to its plans.

15. The University of Windsor continue to offer a master's programme in history according to its plans.

16. In view of the acceptance of the recommendations by COU and the completion of this planning assessment, the Ontario Council on University Affairs request the Minister to remove the embargo on history in accordance with the original announcement of the Minister that new graduate programmes would be embargoed until, for each discipline, a planning study has been conducted.

Action by COU

ACAP is to arrange that the Discipline Group:

a) examine the structure of the PhD requirements in order to make recommendations for shortening the time required to obtain the degree; and

b) explore the likely character and extent of non-university employment opportunities for doctoral graduates.

Notes concerning the recommendations

The dissertation areas for master's and doctoral programmes are described in the text of the ACAP report.

January 10, 1975.

ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC PLANNING

ONTARIO COUNCIL ON GRADUATE STUDIES

REPORT TO THE COUNCIL OF ONTARIO UNIVERSITIES

ON

HISTOPY PLANNING ASSESSMENT

November 1974

PROCEDURE

On the advice of the Ontario Council on Graduate Studies, the Council of Ontario Universities on September 17, 1971, instructed the Advisory Committee on Academic Planning to conduct a formal planning assessment for history.

A Discipline Group was formed consisting of a member named by each interested university. A list of members is attached as Appendix E. Professor E. Wright and later Professor J. Grove held the ACAP portfolio and attended meetings when ACAP representation was necessary.

The procedure and terms of reference for the planning assessment is attached as Appendix D.

The Discipline Group began its meetings in September, 1972. In accordance with the procedure, the Discipline Group provided ACAP with a list of possible consultants. ACAP obtained the services of Professor G.R. Elton of the University of Cambridge, Professor J. Hamelin of Laval University and Professor H. Kreisel of the University of Alberta. Brief curricula vitarum appear as Appendix G. Professor Kreisel played the role of the senior Canadian academic from outside the discipline in this planning assessment. The consultants held their first meeting in Toronto in May, 1973, and discussed with the Discipline Group their schedule of visits to the universities. These took place during August, September, October and December.

The draft report of recommendations was presented to the Discipline Group for informal comments on March 18, 1974, and the final report was subsequently received and distributed March 26, 1974. The universities were requested to submit comments to ACAP by May 6, and the Discipline Group by May 21, after it had seen the comments of the universities.

The Discipline Group comments plus those of the universities appear in Appendices B and C respectively. The latter includes only those comments specified by each university for publication.

After examining the university comments and the Discipline Group response, ACAP felt it needed further clarification and explication from the consultants, especially as to fields of particular strength of the various departments from the point of view of a student in pursuit of a doctorate. Also ACAP felt it was not possible, from the consultants' original report, to produce convincing arguments for the existence of the two new PhD programmes. The ACAP history subcommittee met with Professors Hamelin and Kreisel and discussed the inadequacies of the report. Subsequently, and after consultation with Professor Elton, the consultants submitted an addendum to their report to ACAP. This addendum is attached as Appendix H.

The report then is based on the data, reports and comments described above and sets out recommendations for COU on the plan for graduate work in history in the province for the next several years.

As is required, this report is made directly to COU. It has been transmitted also to the Ontario Council on Graduate Studies and the Council of Deans of Arts and Science for information.

GENERAL INTRODUCTION

Planning Techniques

For some years now, the universities of Ontario have been committed to the belief that the quality and effectiveness of graduate study in the province can be ensured only by collective and cooperative action. This implies a mechanism for continuing consultation and agreement so that the plans of each university for each of its disciplines are concerted with those of the other universities. At any given time there will exist a plan for the development of each discipline, with agreed and understood roles for each department; since graduate education is the most advanced formal intellectual activity and is, therefore, undergoing change, it is necessary that such plans be kept under regular review and be subject to ready amendment.

The Council of Ontario Universities has assigned to the Ontario Council on Graduate Studies the task of advising it on the development of such plans and of the steps to be taken to carry them into effect. The Standing Committee which carries out these tasks for OCGS is the Advisory Committee on Academic Planning. A significant role is also played by the discipline groups, one of which is established for each subject, with a representative from each interested university. Each discipline group has the function of assisting and advising ACAP in connection with its own subject.

The above may give the impression that the planning activity is fragmented on a disciplinary basis. This would, of course, not be acceptable. Since the development of one department in a university should not be considered independently of its contribution to the rest of its university and of the influence of the university as a whole on the department, it is most important that universities as institutions play a central role in the planning process. One of the most effective ways of doing this is by indicating to ACAP the nature of institutional commitments to a department and institutional aspirations for the department.

The most significant single input to a planning assessment is the set of statements from each university of its plans for its department. When these are subjected to collective scrutiny it may be found that their totality constitutes a reasonable plan for the discipline in Ontario, but in any case this set of plans is the first approximation to the provincial plan, which the planning assessment may have to refine if there are duplicated features, lacunae in offerings, too large a total enrolment, or other reasons to recommend altering some of the university plans. The universities are also involved in that the bodies that act on ACAP reports, i.e. both COU and OCGS, are composed of universities.

The formal documents stating the responsibilities of ACAP and the Discipline Groups are Appendix F. Briefly summarized, it is ACAP's function to advise on steps to be taken to implement effective provincial planning at the graduate level, to promote the arranging of the graduate programmes of the province in order to enhance and sustain quality and to avoid undesirable duplication, and, when necessary, to carry out formal planning reviews for disciplines. A discipline group has the responsibility of

keeping under review the plans for graduate work in the discipline and making regular progress reports to ACAP in connection with graduate work in that subject. To make all this possible, it has been agreed that ACAP may communicate directly with universities and discipline groups, to request necessary information, to discuss reports, to convene meetings, and to make and receive proposals for the future.

The above information has been given in some detail because it constitutes the mechanism currently approved by COU for cooperative graduate work. It is fair to say that in 1971 there was no mutually agreed plan for graduate study in any discipline. Our task is not only to generate the first such plan for each subject but also to ensure that it is kept under continual review.

There are four fundamental components in the plan. The first is analysis of the fields of study, the formats of study which should be available to prospective students in the province. The second is an estimate of overall provincial enrolment at master's and doctoral levels based principally on the likely numbers of highly qualified applicants. In regard to considerations of manpower needs for the province of Ontario, ACAP is conscious of the unreliability of forecasts and, except in special cases, subscribes to the approach proposed in the Macdonald Report (1969):

> "The country as a whole and the provinces must be concerned about manpower requirements. This concern can be expressed in the first instance through careful survey and forecasting of manpower needs on a continuing basis. Such forecasts should be given wide circulation. It is reasonable to expect that universities will respond by creating additional opportunities for study in the areas of shortage. In addition, the universities through their counselling services have a duty to advise students about the opportunities in various fields from the standpoint not only of intellectual challenge but also of vocational prospects and social utility. The reaction of prospective students to such forecasts is likely to provide an effective control. We believe the market-place, if its trends are made explicit, offers an adequate governor to prevent serious surfeit and to encourage movement of students toward fields of opportunity."

The third component of the plan is an indication of the role to be played by each department in terms of the programme it will offer and its academic emphasis. Cooperative arrangements between departments are stressed. The fourth component consists of an examination of the enrolment plans of the universities and consideration as to whether the universities' plans and the predicted enrolment for this discipline are consistent. If not, some appropriate action should be recommended to COU. It will be seen that although there may also be other aspects, these are four necessary components in such a plan.

One must hasten to add that the future is uncertain and that to forecast intellectual trends, student interests, and employment markets five years hence is to undertake to examine many variables. Of course, this is not

a new exercise since all universities have had to make decisions about building, staff hiring, library expansion, equipment investment and so forth and have done so on a basis of similar forecasts. Perhaps sometimes the forecasts have been more intuitive than consciously recognized, but they have certainly been there. All that is new is to make such plans systematically for the province.

It will be realized that, at a minimum, the ongoing planning procedures we have indicated requires annual reporting of enrolments and annual examination of admission standards. When there are indications from these or other sources that some aspects of the plan for the discipline are not being realized, it will be necessary for ACAP to initiate a review. Such a review would usually not involve outside consultants. Whether the impetus came from a discipline group, a university or ACAP itself, comments would be sought from all concerned and the review would culminate in a report to COU recommending an amendment to the plan.

If a university notifies ACAP of its intention to depart from its accepted role (for example to enrol numbers substantially at variance with its understood plan), ACAP will review the situation in the light of any other such notifications it may have received and any other pertinent factors. The extent of any further study would depend on the situation, but if ACAP felt that the university's new plan could be a cause for concern, its first step would be to seek full discussion with the university. Normally there would already have been discussion in the discipline group and between universities and the university would have reached its intention after a careful examination of the general situation of graduate study in the discipline. Thus the ACAP decision would be straightforward and a change in plan would be recommended to COU through OCGS. If, however, ACAP still felt that there was a probability that the university's action might be found, on further study, to be potentially harmful to the system, it would probably next seek comment from other universities concerned and from the discipline group. In any case, ACAP would eventually make some recommendation to COU (through OCGS) concerning the variation.

It is difficult without a concrete case to speculate on likely recommendations, but perhaps two hypothetical situations will illustrate the extremes. If a university indicated that, without any marked change in the academic emphasis of its department, it proposed to arrange to enrol somewhere around 70 graduate students instead of about 50, and if there were changes at other universities and no potential developments which could be substantially affected, ACAP would presumably simply notify COU of the university's intention and recommend that it be recognized as an alteration in plan for the discipline. At the other extreme if a university proposed to begin a new programme designed to enrol fairly soon some 30 PhD students in a field of the discipline already well covered in other universities, it would clearly be necessary to obtain reaction from the discipline group and from other universities and perhaps even some expert advice, in order for ACAP to generate an advisory position concerning the impact of the proposal on the system and suggestions to the university concerned and to COU. As has been noted, if there had been advance inter-university discussions and agreement, this would be a positive factor in ACAP's assessment, but there is of course the possibility that the recommendation

would call for modification of the university's intention; we take that to be the obvious consequence of system planning. Of course, the university could decide to act in a manner contrary to a COU recommendation, accepting whatever consequences would result; we take that to be the basic right of university autonomy. It is understood that a university will not act in this way without the notification and review described in the preceding paragraph.

SYSTEM RECOMMENDATIONS

It is emphasized that the consultants' report (Appendices A and H) is an essential and integral part of this report to COU. In the main body of the ACAP report we have dealt only with those aspects of the consultants' report which appear to be particularly significant or which have led us to recommend courses of action. The consultants have prepared an index of departments at the end of their report (Appendix II). For this reason we have not included references to the consultants' report in our university recommendations.

We deal first with some recommendations of general application to history in Ontario. As has been our custom with other disciplines we prefix our recommendations to COU with the symbol 'C' to avoid confusion with the numbering in the COU report.

In their report, the consultants conclude that the PhD programmes in history are "generally in sound shape and indeed meritorious". They note that the standard of the faculty "in general is well above average" although they "do not find many really outstanding persons among them". They emphasize that "the publishing activity of Ontario historians is impressive and that several departments are also active in editing historical journals". On the other hand, the consultants are very concerned about the length of time it takes to complete the PhD degree. They describe this central problem as unsatisfactory, frightening and unacceptable.

Another concern of the consultants is student support. In paragraphs 47-52 and recommendation 14 (section V), they recommend a more consistent policy of student support with more bursaries and fewer teaching assistantships. ACAP feels that there is no unique problem in history and matters of student support are under continual review in OCGS. However ACAP agrees with some university comments which note that teaching assistantships serve a useful role for the graduate student.

In history, as in other library-based disciplines, sound programmes require extensive library holdings. The consultants urge increased financial allocations to libraries for the completion of serial runs. ACAP agrees that this is an important concern and suggests that universities take note of it when drawing up budget priorities. Also, in regard to libraries, the consultants recommend that the Robarts Library be open to all faculty and graduate students in the province (recommendation 17). ACAP notes that there have been well-defined arrangements for some time for the use of all university libraries, including the Robarts Library, by graduate students, faculty and staff of other universities. These arrangements have recently been revised somewhat. It can be seen from the Inter-university Borrowing Project Principles of Agreement and Operating Procedures that graduate students, faculty and staff may borrow directly when visiting another Ontario university library providing the principles of agreement are followed.

Recommendation C1

> It is recommended that the Discipline Group examine the structure of the PhD requirements in order to make recommendations for shortening the time required to obtain the degree and further it is recommended that the universities consider steps to be taken to reduce the incidence of graduate students leaving the university before completing the thesis. (See Appendix A, paragraphs 39, 87-96, 152 and section V, Recommendations 3 and 5).

The consultants stress that the central problem touching the PhD is the length of time it takes to complete the degree and conclude that much of the trouble is due to the present structure of the degree. The Ontario PhD in history combines the most time-absorbing aspects of two different systems. It requires course work in several fields with comprehensive examinations followed by a full-scale dissertation. They have offered their suggestions for reducing the length of time. The Discipline Group agrees that every effort should be made to shorten the time it takes to complete the degree but it rejects the consultants' advice to lighten the requirements without offering any alternatives. ACAP proposes that the Discipline Group review the various stages of graduate training in order to offer suggestions for reducing the length of time taken to complete the degree without affecting the essential purpose and quality of the programme. In this review, the Discipline Group should consider what a thesis is - its nature and length - and the purpose and number of comprehensives. It should be stressed that there is room for variety. Not every university nor every student needs to follow the same rigid pattern. ACAP is aware that universities have a time limit for students to obtain the PhD degree and is surprised at the frequent failure to enforce it.

This recommendation is also directed at the high incidence of part-time, particularly ABD, graduate students in history. In 1972-73 there were 95 ABDs and 224 full-time doctoral students in history in the province. The number of ABDs as a percent of total doctoral enrolment has grown from 19% in 1968-69 to 28% in 1972-73. Part-time master's students in 1972-73 accounted for 44% of a total master's enrolment of 356.

To overcome this problem, the consultants recommend the cessation of part-time study for the PhD and a close control over part-time master's students. In some cases, part-time study for the doctorate may be necessary and even desirable but universities should exercise a close control over any such part-time doctoral study. It should be emphasized that in the case of history the number of part-time graduate students is unduly large.

Recommendation C2

> It is recommended that the Discipline Group explore employment opportunities for graduates other than in university teaching. (See Appendix A, paragraphs 53-55 and section V, Recommendation 13).

The consultants note that the period of expansion for PhDs is at an end. In the future vacancies at universities will be few since most of the recent university posts have been filled by recent graduates. Increasingly graduates will have to rely on non-academic avenues for employment. In a modern industrial society, such as Canada, there has been and still is a growing number of positions for which there is no specific career training but which require the development of analytical skills. One can get access to these positions from a variety of disciplines including history. For example, this is the case for many positions in mass communications and for administrative, research and policy positions in the civil service. However employment of PhDs outside the university is a slowly growing trend and great caution should be used in relying on this trend for employment projections.

DOCTORAL PROGRAMMES IN HISTORY

At present, there are nine universities which offer the PhD in history. As it should be, Canadian history is offered as an area for thesis work at all of the universities with the majority of students preparing theses in this area. In their addendum (Appendix H), the consultants note that the Universities of Toronto, Queen's and York offer students the widest choices. The University of Toronto is "clearly pre-eminent in the province" with an all-embracing programme effectively covering the main areas of history. They point out that both Queen's and Toronto tend to be conservative in their approach to graduate work stressing political history and the conventional methods of historical study. At Queen's, Canadian history predominates but it could "further develop its interests in Britain, the USA and selected parts of Europe". (paragraph 83). The consultants note that "York, because of a very large and highly qualified faculty, and the diversity of interests to be found there, has extraordinary potential, though we feel that the potential has not yet been fully realized".

Together the Universities of Toronto, Queen's and York account for 74 percent of the province's doctoral students. The University of Ottawa, with a very specialized programme, accounts for ten percent. This leaves only 16 percent of the doctoral students for the remaining six universities. Also, Toronto, Queen's and York have a larger proportion of full professors in their graduate faculties than do the other Ontario universities. Indeed, they have 55 percent of the province's total number of full professors. It is clear, therefore, that three universities, Toronto, Queen's and York, have doctoral programmes in history of a recognizably different character from the others. Each of these three departments offers at least four areas of specialization; each has a substantial number of highly qualified faculty; and each has a large fraction of the province's doctoral students. In summary, the Universities of Toronto, Queen's and York should be considered to have general PhD programmes in history. The addition of new fields for PhD theses is of course a matter for appraisal action, although it is also important to inform ACAP and the Discipline Group of any field additions so that the impact on the provincial system can be assessed.*

---

*If any Ontario university wishes to offer a new research area for thesis work, it so informs the Appraisals Committee. The Appraisals Committee may decide that the new field is a natural and limited extension of work underway and that earlier investigations by the Appraisals Committee (or by a planning assessment) give sufficient assurance of quality. In this case, no appraisal would be required. Alternatively, the Appraisals Committee may decide that the new field is sufficiently unrelated to the established ones (in personnel, facilities or scientific interconnections) that an appraisal to establish quality is required. Lastly there is a situation wherein a professor will occasionally pursue a research topic (and employ a student) in a field bordering on the one in which he concentrates. This last type of "occasional thesis" would not normally be discussed with the Appraisals Committee, since it would not be listed amongst the fields the department "advertised" as research areas.

The above refers to appraisal. Insofar as system planning is concerned, all new fields anywhere are matters of report to ACAP and hence the other universities, but in the case of "general" PhD programmes COU approval of a new field is not required, whereas specialized programmes are expected to expand only into areas which seem appropriate to COU at the time a proposal is made.

The Universities of Carleton, Guelph, McMaster, Ottawa, Waterloo and Western Ontario have a more specialized role at the doctoral level. These history departments supervise theses in Canadian history and usually in one other area as well. The addition of new fields for PhD theses should be a matter for both appraisal and provincial planning, the latter involving a submission to ACAP and recommendations by it. Any specialized department wishing to broaden its offering should consider new approaches and areas which are not already well covered by the University of Toronto. The consultants suggest that this would help to balance the study of history in the province, to offset the dominance of the University of Toronto and to avoid unnecessary duplication of resources.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR UNIVERSITIES WITH GENERAL DOCTORAL PROGRAMMES

Recommendation C3

> It is recommended that Queen's University continue to offer a master's programme according to its plans and a general doctoral programme in history.

The chief emphasis of the doctoral programme is on Canadian history. The consultants appear to be critical of Queen's because of the conservative nature of the programme in a department capable of much greater diversity. The fields currently offered for PhD dissertations are Canadian history and select areas of British history, Commonwealth history, military history, European history and American history. More specifically these fields listed by Queen's are: Later Medieval England, 1300-1500; Central European Reformation; France in the 18th Century; France in the 20th Century; Russia, 1855-1955; Germany, 1750-1945; United States, 1763-1877; United States, 1840-1940; British Isles in the 19th or 20th Century; British Empire and Commonwealth, 1850-1940; New England, Nova Scotia, Acadia, New France in the 17th and 18th Centuries; Canada, 1812-1896; Canada, 1878-1957; and Naval and Military history, 1795-1941. ACAP agrees with the consultants' recommendation that Queen's further strengthen the opportunities for doctoral theses in those areas listed above other than Canadian history.

Recommendation C4

> It is recommended that the University of Toronto continue to offer a master's programme and a general doctoral programme in history according to its plans.

The University of Toronto is the "only university in the province which, by ordinary world standards, is to be called major in historical studies" (paragraph 25). This extensive programme effectively covers most of the main areas of history. The Department of History permits PhD dissertations in the following fields: Canada to 1840, 1840 to the present; Europe 1453-1610, 1610-1789, 1789 to the present; Russia from 1682 to the present; East Central Europe from the late 18th century to the present; Britain 1485-1714, 1660-1815, 1815 to the present; American History to 1800; United States 1800 to the present; British and French Colonies in North America to 1783; China in the 19th and 20th centuries; The British Empire; Medieval History to 1150, 1050 to 1494; International Relations in the 19th and 20th centuries; and Modern Africa.*

Besides the Department of History, there are several other departments in the University of Toronto which offer doctoral work in history. The following table lists the areas for PhD dissertations with the relevant department.

---

*The 1974-5 University of Toronto calendar omits Modern Africa as a field.

Department	Area
Classical Studies	Greek and Roman History
History of Art	Ancient, Medieval, Renaissance, Baroque, Modern
Institute for the History and Philosophy of Science and Technology	Sixteen areas listed in the appraisal document
Islamic Studies	Islamic History including Persian, Ottoman, Turkish, Indo-Muslim
Medieval Studies	Medieval History including history of art and history of ideas
Near Eastern Studies	Near Eastern History
Political Economy	Economic History
Sanskrit and Indian Studies	Indian History

Recommendation C5

It is recommended that York University continue to offer a master's programme and a general doctoral programme in history according to its plans.

The University states that the principal fields for PhD dissertations are Canada since 1867 and United States since 1850. But in exceptional cases PhD dissertations are offered in Britain 1815-1914; United States prior to 1850; Europe since 1870; France in the 17th and 18th centuries and China since 1850.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR UNIVERSITIES WITH SPECIALIZED DOCTORAL PROGRAMMES

Recommendation C6

It is recommended that Carleton University continue to offer a master's programme and a specialized doctoral programme in Canadian history according to its plans.

Recommendation C7

It is recommended that the University of Ottawa continue to offer a master's programme and a specialized doctoral programme in the history of New France and France under the Ancien Régime and the history of French Canada according to its plans.

The Carleton department emphasizes new approaches to the study of Canadian socio-economic history and has considerable strength in this area. Naturally the new PhD programme concentrates on Canadian history stressing social and intellectual history rather than the more traditional political and constitutional history.

The University of Ottawa restricts its doctoral theses to topics in the history of New France and France under the Ancien Régime and the history of French Canada. This programme fills a great need in Canada.

Of course, in both departments there are research projects and master's theses in other fields.

The national capital offers unique advantages for doctoral work in Canadian history because of the extensive resources at the Dominion Archives, the National Library, the Parliamentary Library, etc. Moreover, the consultants suggest that "the opportunity exists for immensely fruitful cooperative and complementary enterprises" between Carleton and Ottawa (paragraph 141). Because of the interlocking and reinforcing nature of their strengths in Canadian history, collaboration would allow each university to offer a more balanced programme. Already the two universities cooperate in producing the periodical Histoire Sociale/Social History. ACAP recommends that the two universities initiate conversations to generate specific modalities for developing cooperative work and submit a progress report by January, 1976.

Recommendation C8

It is recommended that the University of Guelph submit a detailed report to ACAP of its future plans soon after the completion of the current review by the Appraisals Committee, and that ACAP then make recommendations concerning the role of Guelph in doctoral work in history. In any case a progress report is requested by June 1975. It is recommended that Guelph continue to offer its master's programme in accordance with its plans.

In May 1971 the OCGS Appraisals Committee approved the PhD programme in history at the University of Guelph to continue in modern British history and Canadian history with a limited enrolment and subject to review in three years. This review is now in process. The review will consider the definition of the areas for doctoral theses, the faculty situation (size, research interests and seniority) and the academic reasons which led the Appraisals Committee to limit student enrolment.

The history department has a strong interest in Scottish Reformation and Calvinist history and the consultants are very enthusiastic about cooperation between the Universities of Guelph and Waterloo in Radical Reformation history. ACAP suggests that the University of Guelph consider the possibility of cooperation in doctoral work with the University of Waterloo.

Recommendation C9

> It is recommended that McMaster University continue to offer a master's programme and a specialized doctoral programme in ancient history (Greek and Roman), Canadian history and modern British history (including Imperial and Commonwealth history) according to its plans.

There are only two Ontario universities which offer doctoral work in ancient history (McMaster and Toronto). ACAP encourages McMaster to maintain this as a strong field, continuing, of course, to draw on the strength of the Classics Department. In the field of Canadian history, McMaster emphasizes the politics and religion of Ontario, demographic studies of Ontario and local Ontario history. The consultants remark on the strength of the University to offer an interdisciplinary programme in English history and society. ACAP encourages McMaster to consider the formation of such a programme drawing on the strengths of related departments.

Recommendation C10

> It is recommended that the University of Waterloo continue to offer a master's programme and a specialized doctoral programme in European history since the Reformation, early modern and modern British history and the history of the British Possessions in the Atlantic Area, and history of Canada and the United States according to its plans.

Although the University has had a favourable appraisal in the above areas for PhD dissertation, the consultants feel that Waterloo is weak in United States history. ACAP notes that the programme will be reviewed by the Appraisals Committee in 1976 according to the standard procedure. The consultants are very enthusiastic about cooperation in doctoral work between the Universities of Guelph and Waterloo in the history of the Radical Reformation. ACAP suggests that the universities consider this possibility.

Recommendation C11

> It is recommended that the University of Western Ontario continue to offer a master's programme and a specialized doctoral programme in Canadian history but with some "modest offerings" in American and British history, including an "added emphasis to social-structural and demographic history" according to its plans.

ACAP is in sympathy with Western's intention to increase the proportion of doctoral students in British and American history. It also seems reasonable to ACAP that there should be doctoral work in Latin American history at Western. ACAP encourages Western to develop its strength in this area and in due course submit it to the Appraisals Committee. The consultants praise the emphasis on local history which is supported by the strength in urban and regional government at Western noted in the political science and geography reports. The consultants feel this is one area of history in which more doctoral work should be encouraged.

MASTER'S PROGRAMMES IN HISTORY

The consultants point out that "the range (at the master's level) is good, even without the all-embracing programme at Toronto" and conclude that "the quality of what is offered varies from the good to the entirely adequate". The consultants strongly favour the MA by dissertation. (Section V, Recommendation 4). They emphasize that as a graduate degree the MA should include a component which differs in essence from the undergraduate degree (paragraph 74). Some consider this to be even more important for the terminal master's student for whom it is the only experience of genuine research than for the intending doctoral student. However ACAP does not intend to make a recommendation concerning MA requirements because it feels there is a case for having several different kinds of programmes available to graduate students. It is likely that enrolment at the master's level will continue to grow since there are indications that more schoolteachers may return to university to improve their scholarly qualifications.

Universities which offer only master's programmes should concentrate on strengthening their undergraduate and master's programmes rather than contemplating doctoral work. Brock is the only university which does not offer a master's programme. ACAP notes that a master's programme is not in the approved Brock University Five-Year Plan.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR UNIVERSITIES WITH MASTER'S PROGRAMMES

Recommendation C12

It is recommended that Lakehead University continue to offer a master's programme in Canadian history.

If Lakehead decides to expand its programme to include modern British history as the consultants suggest, referral to the Appraisals Committee would be necessary. ACAP can see no objection to such an expansion on grounds of planning.

Recommendation C13

It is recommended that Laurentian University continue to offer a master's programme in history as outlined in the University's Five-Year Plan.

The approved Five-Year Plan of Laurentian University states that the current programme in history will continue whether or not there is a favourably appraised programme in Canadian Studies. The University calendar states that the master's programme is offered in Nineteenth Century Social History of North America and Europe.

Recommendation C14

It is recommended that Trent University continue to offer a master's programme in history according to its plans.

The University offers master's work in the areas of Canadian and "connectional" history, Medieval history, and the theory of history. The 1973-4 graduate calendar describes Canadian and connectional history as focusing on Canadian history but with an emphasis on the wider British, Imperial and American contexts of that history. Research may deal with political, cultural, social and economic topics primarily in the nineteenth century.

Recommendation C15

It is recommended that Wilfrid Laurier University continue to offer a master's programme in history according to its plans.

The programme concentrates on North America and Europe. ACAP encourages Wilfrid Laurier to consider the possibilities for cooperation with the University of Waterloo as suggested by the consultants.

Recommendation C16

It is recommended that the University of Windsor continue to offer a master's programme in history according to its plans.

The programme concentrates on political history of the 19th and 20th centuries. The geographical focus is on Canada, United States, Western Europe (mainly France and Germany), the British Isles (mainly England) and Russia. There is also some emphasis on social and intellectual aspects of history.

RECOMMENDATION FOR COU ACTION

Recommendation C17

It is recommended that COU adopt the recommendations of this report, and, in the expectation that its members will act in accordance with them, COU inform OCUA that it has adopted these recommendations and request that the embargo on history be now removed, in accordance with the original announcement of the Minister that new graduate programmes would be embargoed until, for each discipline, a planning assessment has been conducted.

RECOMMENDATIONS

C1

It is recommended that the Discipline Group examine the structure of the PhD requirements in order to make recommendations for shortening the time required to obtain the degree and further it is recommended that the universities consider steps to be taken to reduce the incidence of graduate students leaving the university before completing the thesis. (See Appendix A, paragraphs 39, 87-96, 152 and section V, Recommendations 3 and 5).

C2

It is recommended that the Discipline Group explore employment opportunities for graduates other than in university teaching. (See Appendix A, paragraphs 53-55, and section V, Recommendation 13).

C3

It is recommended that Queen's University continue to offer a master's programme according to its plans and a general doctoral programme in history.

C4

It is recommended that the University of Toronto continue to offer a master's programme and a general doctoral programme in history according to its plans.

C5

It is recommended that York University continue to offer a master's programme and a general doctoral programme in history according to its plans.

C6

It is recommended that Carleton University continue to offer a master's programme and a specialized doctoral programme in Canadian history according to its plans.

C7

It is recommended that the University of Ottawa continue to offer a master's programme and a specialized doctoral programme in the history of New France and France under the Ancien Régime and the history of French Canada according to its plans.

C8

It is recommended that the University of Guelph submit a detailed report to ACAP of its future plans soon after the completion of the current review by the Appraisals Committee, and that ACAP then make recommendations concerning the role of Guelph in doctoral work in history. In any case a progress report is requested by June 1975. It is recommended that Guelph continue to offer its master's programme in accordance with its plans.

C9

It is recommended that McMaster University continue to offer a master's programme and a specialized doctoral programme in ancient history (Greek and Roman), Canadian history and modern British history (including Imperial and Commonwealth history) according to its plans.

C10

It is recommended that the University of Waterloo continue to offer a master's programme and a specialized doctoral programme in European history since the Reformation, early modern and modern British history and the history of the British Possessions in the Atlantic Area, and history of Canada and the United States according to its plans.

C11

It is recommended that the University of Western Ontario continue to offer a master's programme and a specialized doctoral programme in Canadian history but with some "modest offerings" in American and British history including an "added emphasis to social-structural and demographic history" according to its plans.

C12

It is recommended that Lakehead University continue to offer a master's programme in Canadian history.

C13

It is recommended that Laurentian University continue to offer a master's programme in history as outlined in the University's Five-Year Plan.

C14

It is recommended that Trent University continue to offer a master's programme in history according to its plans.

C15

It is recommended that Wilfrid Laurier continue to offer a master's programme in history according to its plans.

C16

It is recommended that the University of Windsor continue to offer a master's programme in history according to its plans.

C17

It is recommended that COU adopt the recommendations of this report, and, in the expectation that its members will act in accordance with them, COU inform OCUA that it has adopted these recommendations and request that the embargo on history be now removed, in accordance with the original announcement of the Minister that new graduate programmes would be embargoed until, for each discipline, a planning assessment has been conducted.

A P P E N D I X A

CONSULTANTS' REPORT

GRADUATE STUDIES
IN THE HISTORY DEPARTMENTS
OF THE
UNIVERSITIES OF ONTARIO

G.R. Elton
Jean Hamelin
Henry Kreisel

Submitted to the
Advisory Committee on Academic Planning
Ontario Council on Graduate Studies
Council of Ontario Universities
March, 1974

CONTENTS

Prefatory Note	A-iii
I. Introduction	A-1
II. The Present State of Affairs	A-8
(A) Faculty	A-8
(a) Numbers	A-8
(b) Ranks	A-10
(c) Distribution by Interests: Regions	A-11
(d) Distribution by Interests: Periods and Aspects	A-13
(e) General Comments	A-16
(B) Graduate Students	A-18
(a) Numbers	A-18
(b) Degrees Awarded	A-19
(c) Distribution by Universities	A-20
(d) Sources of Student Supply and Support	A-23
(e) Employment	A-26
(f) General Comments	A-27
(C) MA Programs	A-30
(a) General	A-30
(b) Structure of the Degree	A-31
(c) Areas of Study for Dissertation Work	A-34
(D) PhD Programs	A-38
(a) General	A-38
(b) Structure	A-38
(c) Areas of Research	A-45
(d) So Many Schools of Research?	A-47
(E) Cooperation	A-48
(a) Informal	A-48
(b) Intra-University Arrangements	A-49
(c) Inter-University Arrangements	A-51
(F) Libraries and Archives	A-52
(a) Libraries	A-53
(b) Archives	A-57
(c) Summary	A-58
III. Immediate Developments	A-60
IV. The Future	A-64
(a) Manpower Planning	A-64
(b) The Future of Graduate Programs	A-66
(c) Teaching Structure	A-69
(d) The Future of Cooperation	A-69
(e) The Language Problem	A-71
(f) Libraries	A-72

V. Summary of Recommendations A-73

VI. Conclusions A-75

Appendix I: Tables A-76
I. Growth of full-time faculty (1968/73) A-77
II. Full-time faculty by Departments (1972/73) A-78
III. Graduate Faculty (1972/73) A-79
IV. Full-time faculty - professorial ranks (1972/73) A-80
V. Departmental Distribution of graduate faculty (senior ranks) and graduate students (1972/73) A-81
VI. Distribution of faculty ranks: percentages A-82
VII. Faculty Specialization: Regions A-83
VIII. Faculty Specialization: Aspects (1972/73) A-84
IX. Faculty Specialization: Periods (1972/73) A-85
X. Faculty Specialization: Percentages (1972/73) A-86
XI. MA Students in History (1968/73) A-87
XII. PhD Students in History A-88
XIII. Graduate students: total number (1968/73) A-89
XIV. Graduate students: percentage increase (1968/73) A-89
XV. Graduate students: departmental distribution: percentages (1972/73) A-90
XVI. Degrees awarded (1968/73) A-91
XVII. Graduate students: origins (1972/73) A-92
XVIII. Full-time graduate students: sources of financial support (1968/73) A-93
XIX. Employment of PhDs (1968/73) A-94
XX. Library Support A-95

Appendix II: Index of Departments A-96

Peiora expectavimus, bona invenimus,
meliora appetimus.

PREFATORY NOTE

In this report, we base analysis and comment on numerical statistics provided for us which are of necessity not always sufficient or accurate. Shifts of interest, for instance, or changes in appointments were rendering some details out of date even while we were studying the situation. This could not be helped, and no one is to blame. We are therefore aware that some of our figures and percentages are liable to be slightly out of true, but we have felt obliged to provide a reasonable foundation of information and have good reason to think that the intruding inaccuracies are too small to affect either the resulting picture or the conclusions drawn.

Our brief does not compel us, and our rapid investigations do not qualify us, to attempt a full-scale appraisal of individual departments: we are concerned with the whole situation in the province and see particular institutions in that setting.

I. INTRODUCTION

1. The problems of graduate work in history can be properly understood only in the context of university studies in history in general. We must therefore begin by explaining what we conceive the nature of historical study to be - its function in universities specifically as well as in society at large, together with the consequences this has for the enquiry in which we have been engaged. We would emphasize that any appearance of arrogance or conceit should be put down to the effects of inescapable compression; in setting out the virtues and importance of history we do not mean to decry any other form of study.

2. The study of history is recognized to possess certain mind-forming qualities useful both to the individual and to society. A knowledge of the past greatly enlarges a man's acquaintance; it provides criteria for judgment and action in human affairs. Men, as Francis Bacon said, are rendered wise by history. The insistence that conclusions be based on reasoned inference from established evidence provides a training in practical logic and exercises the reasoning faculties. A trained understanding of the past is an essential contribution to all forms of learning none of which exist without their own prehistory. More particularly, the academic practice of the subject provides a training for functions necessary in society and qualifies its products for work involving administration, teaching and research. Despite recent attacks from various quarters, enrolment figures and publishers' catalogues show that historical studies remain among the most attractive and immediately useful labours of the university.

3. However, it can justly be argued that history shares many of these qualities with other forms of study. It needs therefore to be said that the discipline occupies rather a unique place in the enterprises of the mind. By and large, academic disciplines fall into two categories. Some are predominantly concerned with imparting knowledge and skills usable in a lifetime's work: they are essentially directed towards training people to pursue stated avocations. Others attend to predominantly academic and educational purposes; they may, and almost certainly will, produce teachers, but their chief interest lies in creating superior minds. No doubt few disciplines answer absolutely to this distinction, but nearly all can be readily assigned to one class or the other. History stands between them, being both a training subject for a variety of employments (historians, archivists, librarians, civil servants) and selfconsciously an instrument for improving intelligence and sensitivity. Concerned as it is with whatever men have done, suffered, thought, written or experienced, it often seems to lack precise definition as a subject, a problem which has become more manifest as historians have carried their interests from such things as politics and war into the social, economic and intellectual happenings of the past. History at times appears less as an academic discipline than as an attitude of mind living parasitically on the disciplinary skills of others. This, however, is an illusion, an illusion sometimes fostered

by incomprehension among those (let us not define them) who confuse the identification of a discipline with the possession of technical devices like quantifiability or model-building. There certainly is a discipline - a craft - of history with an area of operations and methods of proceeding peculiar to itself. Historical knowledge and interpretation depend on the use of teachable methods - sceptical and imaginative skills of investigation - which were evolved to meet the problems of dealing with a peculiar type of material for study: the haphazardly preserved and finite (not augmentable) evidence left behind by the past. The nature of this evidence has compelled the development of strict techniques of discovery and evaluation to which all other techniques (often borrowed from other disciplines) must be subordinated. Historians have to consider evidence exhaustively, not in a selection directed by provisional hypotheses; they cannot add to their evidence by such techniques as extrapolation or imaginative reconstruction; they must explain backwards from effects to causes, not forward from established facts to consequences; they operate on the assumption that questions may turn out to be unanswerable. In these and other ways, they differ from both natural and social scientists. Historical study is that study which practises the historical method.

4. The other objection to which the middle position of history gives rise is that it offers neither usefulness nor relevance. The past, being dead (we are told), can at best provide amusement for the many or an ivory-tower preoccupation for the few. At worst it is alleged to be almost anti-intellectual in that its awareness of accident and the contingent inhibits rational and especially radical thought and makes its devotees live in a dead past. We are not here obliged to defend history against its more philistine detractors, but this accusation (and even more extreme reactions against the learned study of the past on the grounds that what is wanted is an untrammelled new world) matters here because it mistakes the nature of history, because it destroys the human roots of society, and because it is gaining ground among politicians, administrators, and professional educationalists. (It has to be admitted that the confident planning of new worlds is made easier when history is forgotten - easier but not more successful.) Even though good history must be about the past and must accord that past the respect of treating it in its own right, not merely as the presumed precursor of a later day, historical study is not simply backward-looking and uninvolved. Whether the historian is a determinist or not (few are), whether he would vote for this party or that, whether he treats of the cold war between Russia and the United States or of the hot war between Sparta and Athens, are all points of no significance at all. What matters is the contribution which historical understanding makes to a man's understanding of his world and the understanding he can teach others to acquire.

5. The one constant element in historical experience is change: the task of creatively understanding the past boils down to identifying, explaining and evaluating change. History, properly understood, compels its practitioners to avoid ossification - either that ossification which

comes from the cessation of thought or that which results from submission to intellectual authority. By creating no systems it offers the prospect of untrammelled comprehension and the acceptance of novelty as much as the preservation of tradition. Though the study of history deals with a past which only the blind and deaf could call dead, it constantly looks to the future: not in the crude sense of studying the past so as to discover forecasts or precepts but in the very subtle sense in which a comprehension of changes gone by instructs the mind in contemplating, planning and accepting changes to come. It is in this effect that history becomes very important to any society: liberation to the intellect and reassurance to the soul. Historians, who professionally think in the flux of events, are exceptionally conditioned to cope with the facts of life. It is true that a sufficient acquaintance with the fate that so often has overtaken human aspirations good and bad is liable to breed some doubt, even cynicism, in the face of those ever recurring panaceas, but in fact the historian can provide criteria of discrimination and choice in the judgment of any program which society should value. Indeed, if history did no more than teach a measure of stoicism to a world rather notably devoid of that quality it would justify its existence well enough. However, there is more to it than that - more than can here be elaborated, though one fundamental fact about the historian's proper involvement with his world should be recorded. Historians usually choose their avocation because they have an interest in people as individuals, and they do not find it easy to suppose that mankind came to an end before the age in which they live. A precise learned discipline which, confronted with the faceless entities and agglomerations of the social sciences, remembers the particularity of men and women is something that no civilization can afford to be without.

6. History, thus, has an identity of its own and bears directly upon the problems which confront the world every passing day. These truths, however, do not define its place in a university where, as we have said, it seems liable to stand between the two main camps, to partake of characteristics belonging to both, and to exasperate in consequence both by seemingly failing to come up to the ideal concept entertained of itself by either. The function of the man in the middle is to get hammered by the two men on either side of him, and this has certainly happened to history. However, that function could be to pull the extremes together, to act as a bridge rather than a punch-ball, and it seems to us that history has of late been gaining increasing recognition in this respect. All sorts of academic disciplines have been discovering historical dimensions in themselves: even practitioners of enterprises traditionally based on theory and general laws have found it more and more desirable to use historical techniques in order to adjust their models of reality to reality itself. We may point to the present growth of the history of science, pursued now not only to discover past beliefs about nature but also in order to gain a better understanding of the present state of scientific investigation. In sociology and even in political science, fruitful advance seems increasingly to depend less on the formulation of theories of behaviour or the accummulation of detail

to be subordinated to such theories, but on the testing and evaluation of both by methods of enquiry first developed by the historian and still best practised by him. The obvious truth that there is a history to everything that men do is coming to be reflected in a growing desire to explore historical dimensions everywhere.

7. These developments, sensible and welcome though they must be, are not without their dangers. Serious historical study yielding results of value can no more be pursued by the untrained amateur than can studies in economics or biochemistry; and when they turn historians, biochemists and economists are amateurs. Insofar as other subjects will develop a concern with their history and with historical methods of enquiry, they will depend on the guidance, cooperation and instruction of professional historians. They will, that is, have to make use of the existence among them of a subject in the middle which reaches out in all directions and, while sure of its reasonable autonomy, is exceptionally concerned to interact and assist. The fact is that, despite current talk of the decline of historical studies or the folly of pursuing interests of no immediate "relevance", the man in the middle is seen more and more as a middle-man, not a common target for attack. Current academic developments outside history have made the existence of a truly important department of history more essential than ever to all universities. Universities cannot nowadays afford to neglect the promotion of a competent body of professional historians in their midst because history is one of the few disciplines capable of counteracting the splintering effect of specialization. As things are, historians can and should provide the major element of coordination and control for all the enterprises of a studium universale. At their best - and they should be driven to be at their best - historians have it in them to be the theologians of the modern academy.

8. This may sound extravagant and absurd. That, however, historians in fact carry out some such function is quite readily seen in undergraduate courses. In universities based on the honours system usual in Europe, history is the subject chosen by the few who want to train as professionals and the many who want a general education; and history students lead the demand for new areas of enquiry and interdisciplinary enterprises. In the multiple-subject system of North American education, history is, for similar reason, a common major subject for those seeking to acquire culture and a still more common minor subject for those who wish to add culture to qualifications. Evidently, many young minds engaged among the rudiments of improvement find in history precisely that approach to generalized understanding which makes the subject a coordinator among its companions. Possessed, even at the undergraduate level, of a sizeable core of necessary knowledge, it can train rational abilities and a reasonable objectivity better than less mundane, more imaginative disciplines. The qualities which advanced practitioners acquire and cultivate can be discerned in embryo among undergraduates, and the importance of history in the undergraduate teaching work of any university can no more be overstated than its role among men of learning. In this enquiry we are not concerned with undergraduate courses or teaching, but the foundations of every department of history lie there,

and the point must be made. All the institutions that we have looked at pride themselves on the attention they give to undergraduates; academic historians in the province of Ontario regard themselves in the first place as teachers and would wish to have their performance judged by that criterion. We fully accept these claims and their justice. But if the power base of these history departments lies in their activities with undergraduates, certain consequences follow for their graduate programs.

9. Thus: the health of every university demands a good and sound department of history because history above other disciplines can and does act as the coordinator and interpreter of all the intellectual enterprises in the institution, and because at undergraduate level history provides a flexible and varied service which is much in demand and generally well catered for. What, then, makes a history department good and sound? The answer, once again, arises from those features which distinguish historical studies as an intellectual and, one might almost say, a spiritual enterprise. A training in history aims to produce a particular form of the enquiring mind: an understanding of human behaviour and action, through time, derived from the precise and cautious assessment of all the available evidence. The sound historical method avoids the pursuit of single, identified questions and distrusts all answers that embody single causes. If a metaphor be permitted: where other disciplines instruct their practitioners to follow paths through the wilderness of ignorance (existing paths or paths they are the first to blaze) the historian, at all stages of his development, is expected to strike off into the untrodden ground and to ramble away from the path to which he returns only to stray off again and again. A proper understanding of anything in the past depends on the possession of a mass of seemingly irrelevant information from within which alone the particular can be understood; it also depends on the possession of an imaginative, evaluating and coordinating mind which has grasped that what is significant can be discovered only when it is recognized that in the first instance nothing is insignificant. The trained historian should display very wide knowledge and an imagination that is both creative and disciplined - and that valuable combination is not as rare in the profession as the scurrilous legend likes to pretend. But it is certain that it takes time to produce these qualities; historians notoriously improve with age.

10. For a university education in history, the consequences of this necessary ideal are that the ordinary distinction between undergraduate and postgraduate study loses much of its precision. Of course, there is an unmistakable difference between the undergraduate student and the research student, but the characteristics of both states appear also in the other with a frequency unusual in other disciplines. Undergraduate exercises turn into proto-research, while course work and fields and the usual manner of supervision continue to remind the graduate student of his earlier identity. (We shall see that in Ontario these points of continuity are often more manifest than the equally important elements of transformation.) History takes its time, and anything resembling a sound education in it is not obtained, in any academic

system, at the stage of the first degree; and this applies not only to the production of professional historians but quite as much to the production of sensible, generally educated, men and women. Thus the bachelor's degree becomes less a milestone than a momentary resting place for the drawing of breath. It should be recognized that relatively little of the fruitful effects of historical study accrues to the student who abandons that study at BA level.

11. The second point to grow from this state of affairs concerns those who teach. A department whose work is confined to undergraduates lives in an artifically truncated condition. As we have said, the departments that we have inspected generally pride themselves on their undergraduate teaching, and justly so. We do not begin to deny the importance of this work or to question the dedication of men and women who devote themselves to it. Insofar as this often-expressed pride represents resistance to the pernicious notions that university teachers are to be judged solely by "their own work" and that eminence increases with the distance from the undergraduate, the characteristic belief in undergraduate teaching which we have encountered calls for loud applause. But when (as at times it does) it cries down the necessity for post-graduate work it raises serious doubts. Whether or not they continue to pursue their own research (and if they do not, they have some real difficulty in remaining intellectually alive), teachers of history do decline in quality if their whole professional lives are spent with undergraduates. Academic instructors are not schoolteachers and should not behave as though they were, any more than they are gentlemen of leisure entitled to follow that code of behaviour. For the academic mind to remain in a state of alert competence, it needs to encounter the challenge of other minds beyond the BA stage. Teaching graduate students, at least up to the master's degree, is in general not a luxury but a simple necessity if the quality of the department is to be maintained. And a case can be made for thinking that a teacher who never supervises a PhD student is at least in serious danger of decline.

12. We therefore maintain that in history departments graduate programs are essential because, in the first place, they provide an inseparable advanced phase of that education which the department exists to provide, and secondly because without them the members of the department are unlikely to maintain the qualities which make them good scholars and teachers. By the terms of this enquiry, we shall concern ourselves with graduate work only, but we cannot accept that, in history, this sector can be divorced from a full view of the department's total work - in teaching and research and writing, in everything that touches its professional role and educational service. Some things we shall have nothing to say about because they lie outside our competence. We cannot usefully speculate concerning the province's future investment in universities or the fortunes of the learned world at large. We do not suppose that assessment or advice should feed on personal prejudice or whim. We respect honestly held opinions even where we feel forced to disagree with them. But neither can we ignore the frame of thought, based on experience and reflection, which underlies these introductory

remarks. Particular circumstances assuredly modify particular conclusions, but we hold, without qualification, to the view that the serious study of history is an activity necessary to the intellectual and moral well-being of any community and that it is the duty of every university to provide for it. We think that no analysis which does not start from that assumption is worth having.

II. THE PRESENT STATE OF AFFAIRS

(A) Faculty

(a) Numbers

13. In 1972/73, there were 415 full-time teachers of history in the fifteen departments of history in Ontario (Table I). This, however, is a somewhat misleading figure. A good deal of history is taught in other departments, for example of economics, which do not come within the compass of this enquiry. It would appear that the additional numbers involved are small, except at Toronto where alone we have been provided with accurate information. The 68 members of the department there are reinforced by 6 people teaching in the Institute for the History and Philosophy of Science and Technology, 5 historians in the Department of Near Eastern Studies, 12 persons specializing in history but domiciled in the Department of Political Economy, 3 art historians, and 6 ancient historians in the Department of Classical Studies. In addition there are 5 historical specialists in the Centre for Medieval Studies, outside the department but closely associated with it. Thus it would give a truer picture to say that Toronto students have some 105 teachers of history to draw upon, and students elsewhere would also find specialists available to them not accounted for in our figures. However, it would appear that the teaching activities of history departments involve little use of colleagues elsewhere; and while we would wish to remain aware of these additional resources, we think it right to confine our investigations essentially to members of history departments proper.

14. The total of 415 represents an increase of about 34% in five years, since 1968/69, and that increase has been pretty steady, greatest in 1970/71 and, significantly, showing signs of coming to an end during the last year covered. We recognize that this augmentation is part of the general expansion of university studies in the province since the mid-sixties, and that the expansion of history has simply been part of a process. It should be noted that the expansion lagged well behind the experience of some other departments. Sociology, for instance, justifiably nowadays regarded as a rival to history in attracting students, shows a much greater percentage growth in five years, but this reflects the fact that, being a more recent discipline in university teaching, it started from a much lower base. The growth of history has been proportionate to general growth and in the main to need - so far at least. It has, obviously, been greatest in new institutions: out of the 105 appointments added in five years, York has laid claim to 36 and Waterloo to 14, while Toronto contented itself with 9 and Queen's with 6. (The York expansion may be regarded as exceptional, peculiar, and possibly disquieting.) But no single department has stood still, and the general situation at present should be described as healthy - moderately expansive according to need and opportunity, yet well enough controlled to avoid the danger of undermining standards. We attend in Section IV to the problems of the future.

15. A look at the distribution of this teaching strength shows that there are three kinds of departments in the province: small, middling and large (Table II). The two giants, of course, are Toronto and York, a fact which would become even more apparent if all the Toronto historians were included. (If Toronto were counted to have 105 historians instead of 68, its percentage holding would read 25 instead of 16.) A solid middle group includes five institutions - two relatively ancient (Queen's and Ottawa), two relatively young (Carleton, Waterloo), and one that has grown markedly from a small older base (Western). McMaster heads the list of those who each dispose of less than 5% of the total; it really straddles the divide between the middling and the small departments, and it also raises a measure of surprise because the university as a whole by size alone would seem to merit a higher place than it receives here. Thus except perhaps for McMaster, the table of percentages reflects pretty accurately the range of overall size of the universities; or, in other words, history departments everywhere would appear to be properly founded and would seem to be receiving a fair share of available resources. No history department can claim cinderella status in its own university, but only York perhaps could be thought of as specially favoured. These facts reflect the general position: history occupies an established and recognized place of importance in the work of all the universities in question.

16. From the point of view of this enquiry, the total number of full-time faculty is misleading in yet another way. By no means everybody is involved in graduate teaching, and a look at the graduate faculty is therefore necessary, though it should be said at once that further analysis will continue to comprise all teachers. Considerations of potential development require that we should concern ourselves also with those who are available for work with graduate students, even though at present they do not engage in it. The total of the graduate faculty (full-time) is 226 (Table III), or only just over half the available resources. Here the league table makes clearer distinctions. Toronto and York remain well ahead of everybody else; McMaster's percentage rises significantly, as does Western's. Ottawa and Carleton change places, a fact descriptive of the larger and older graduate program found at the former. Brock, Laurentian, Wilfrid Laurier, Trent and Lakehead virtually vanish from sight. However, all that these figures usefully show is the fact that graduate work is much more concentrated in fewer places than the teaching of history generally (i.e. to undergraduates). This is to be expected; what matters is that even so there is still a pretty wide range of institutions significantly involved in graduate programs. Despite the manifest ascendancy of Toronto (and York), enough serious work goes forward elsewhere to justify our speaking in terms of a general situation.

17. The big question raised by the number of graduate faculty is, of course, the gap between it and the overall total, especially in view of our conviction, stated in para. 11 above, that work with advanced students is a necessary part of scholarly existence. What about the 189 teachers who appear to be left without such work? The answer, not

surprisingly, emerges from the tables of professional status (Tables III and IV). Of the 91 full professors and the 151 associate professors, 77 and 102 work in graduate programs; of the 117 assistant professors and 48 lecturers, only 45 and 2 do. It is senior faculty, by status and in the main by age, that teach graduate students, and this is particularly true of the best established graduate programs. At Toronto, for instance, all the full professors and all but two associate professors are involved; at Western we find 25 out of 28 members of the three senior grades so employed, but none of the rather high (8) number of lecturers. We therefore conclude that the gap between all faculty and graduate faculty is to be explained by two phenomena: fairly recent recruitment, during the period of expansion, of new teachers still being processed for more advanced work (e.g. still finishing their own PhDs), and the very recent initiation of some graduate programs which are still too small to bring in the majority of teachers. While on the face of it the presence of 189 (45.6%) persons who do not teach anyone but undergraduates is disquieting, the discoverable explanations suggest that this is a temporary phenomenon, produced by the very recent phase of expansion, and probably likely to disappear.

18. This conclusion also justifies our decision to analyze the standing and interests of all teaching faculty. The persons not yet involved will, we hope and prognosticate, come soon to be so and will bring their special concerns and abilities to the programs.

(b) Ranks

19. There are significant differences in the proportion of senior and junior faculty at the various universities (Table VI). The figure which matters here is that of full and associate professors combined, for the established strength of a department lies there. In the province as a whole they occupy 59% of teaching posts, which seems about right: one wants to see just over half the total on the settled side, whereas any higher proportion would argue an insufficiency of new blood and proclaim the dangers of ossification. True, a high proportion of senior faculty testifies to a successful search for excellence and eminence (see especially Carleton), but it militates against future developments and should be adjusted as soon as possible by the recruitment of juniors. On the other hand, a relatively young department with a lot of unestablished faculty in it lacks experience and authority. Thus departments significantly in excess of the provincial figure need to consider the limitations which this puts on flexibility; those that fall well below it need to take steps against immaturity and lack of weight. Among the first, the most striking case is that of Ottawa with 71% senior faculty - most striking because the department at the same time has a very low number of full professors. Waterloo's 62% comes close to the desirable level, but here, too, an excessive number of professors are of associate status. Waterloo is the product of recent

expansion, and seniority will come with time; Ottawa has gone through a recent remodelling of a faculty which had grown superannuated, and much the same development may be expected. This, however, does not alter the fact that at both universities the balance is at present wrong and needs adjusting. Even more out of true is Carleton's 74%, well distributed between the two grades; this is a department in which younger people may for some time have difficulty in making their way, or rather (since the "senior" faculty themselves are generally quite young in years) one which will have few vacancies to offer for a long time.

20. On the other side we may note York whose mushroom growth has left it with a large department distributed around a low mean, a prescription for internal promotion rather than fresh recruitment, or Western whose recent growth upon a rather elderly base has produced similar results. At Lakehead and Laurentian we are dealing with brave beginnings rather than developed situations, and it may thus be too early for comment; nevertheless, we wish to point out that even existing programs there will suffer unless an effort is made to improve quality and quantity at the senior end. Much the same should be said of Trent. The two oldest universities - Toronto and Queen's - produce figures which suggest strong elements of solidification, a preponderance (marked in the second case) of full professors over associates is a sign of the predominance of well settled people, some of them approaching the age of retirement. Both places, predictably, struck us as pretty conservative, but it seems likely that both will before long find themselves undergoing changes in the wake of the necessary replacement of faculty. Over all, therefore, the age structure and distribution of professional status, which <u>in toto</u> look quite satisfactory, are in most individual cases a trifle disquieting. Now that expansion has come to a stop, there is hardly anywhere enough room to manoeuvre, and while a little room will probably soon show itself at Queen's, Toronto and McMaster, most departments will have to work within the terms already set and may find it difficult to satisfy the legitimate ambitions of junior faculty. The possible consequences of such a situation do not need spelling out.

(c) <u>Distribution by Interests: Regions</u>

21. The impression of a certain standardization which these figures support is reinforced by a look at the main interests of the teaching faculty. We turn first to the allocation of specialists by regions of the world (Table VII). On the face of it, this is not unreasonable. One expects every country to study its own history first, and the fact that only about 25% of professors specialize in the history of Canada might be taken as a sign of a happy lack of isolationism - or alternatively as a sign of a less happy lack of confidence in national identity. The largest single area of interest is western Europe (i.e. France, Germany, Italy, Scandinavia, the Netherlands, Spain); if

the 84 specialists in British and Imperial history and the forty whose area of work is eastern Europe are added, the Old World preempts some 51% of teachers. It is evident that something must give, and in this case the least satisfactory position appears in "third-world" studies. Over 60 specialists in American history is probably enough, in view of the fact that the subject receives such overwhelming attention south of the 49th parallel.

22. However, this is a superficial analysis which needs a closer look. In the first place, the total of specialized interests exceeds the total of faculty by almost 100 because a number of people specified several areas. This may indeed fairly reflect their interests, but it must be doubted whether it fairly reflects their ability to pursue research and instruct graduate students. Both the returns and the impression left in conversation suggest that the normal present-day situation really applies in Ontario, too: namely, one regional specialization per man. This is so even at Trent and Queen's whose professors distort the total by including a high proportion of men professing an interest in two regions. It is not possible to make accurate allowances for these discrepancies, but it looks as though readjustments would reduce the proponderance of western Europe (especially France) and give pride of place (by a short head) to Canada.

23. Secondly, the balance varies a lot between universities. As one might expect, all the smaller institutions find it difficult to cover all the ground; but, their total teaching strength considered, Ottawa and perhaps even York do badly by British history, Waterloo and Carleton by American. Ottawa's American specialists include not one Frenchman. The minor interests - Africa, Asia, Latin America - are very much confined to Toronto and York, with Waterloo making a gallant effort.

24. Thirdly, it should be noted that these are the professed interests of the total faculty, not of those involved in graduate teaching. This does not matter too much because, we hope, the existence of "exotic" interests in the more junior faculty may soon find an outlet in the territorial expansion of graduate programs, but it is a point worth making. Analysis of one apparently well diversified department will illustrate the situation. If York's 39 graduate teachers are studied in place of all 75, the figures read: Canadian, 12; American, 7; British, 2; West European, 10; East European, 4; Asian, 4; African, 2; Latin American, 2; others, 2. The heaviest loser is western Europe, almost all the teachers remaining being specialists in French history alone, while British (and Imperial) history effectively vanishes. Canada stands out as dominant, and America holds her own. Interestingly, the exceptional interest in third-world history is here covered by senior people, i.e. in this respect the effort at diversification is very real.

25. What all this underlines, however, is the exceptional position of Toronto. Here the figures adjusted for graduate faculty only read:

Canada 15; America 8; Britain 7; western Europe 14; eastern Europe 3; Asia 3; Africa 1; Latin America 1. The West European contingent covers the major countries - no French monopoly here. In addition, as has already been said, Toronto possesses outside the department medievalists (British and European), historians of science and of art, a solid body of economic historians (several regions), Islamic historians, and classical historians, many of whom do cooperate in the teaching of graduate students (many do not). Toronto is the only university in the province which, by ordinary world standards, is to be called major in historical studies. It must therefore be emphasized that here the facts reveal a highly traditional distribution of interests, with third-world matters far from well represented and conventional Canadian history predominant. This is not in itself a matter for censure. Toronto embodies the traditional core of historical studies in the province, and it is right that there should be a mainly conservative centre to the discipline among so large a number of institutions. But these facts ought to be taken into account by other departments who would be well advised not to copy or rival Toronto but to seek special distinction in areas not so well attended to by the giant.

(d) Distribution by Interests: Periods and Aspects

26. These conclusions are reinforced by a study of the periods and aspects offered by teaching faculty. Here we again return to the total number of professors and once more note that the figures are influenced by answers listing more than one item. First, periods (Tables IX and X). Here the analysis is especially complicated by the absence of the Toronto "extras": ancient history has more practitioners than the 15 persons (3%) indicated, though the five medievalists at the Centre for Medieval Studies would not increase the percentage allocated to that subject. The obvious dominance of modern history, especially of the 19th and 20th centuries, though it almost amounts to deformation, comes as no surprise; apart from anything else, the dominant subject of Canadian history begins for many only in 1867 and for no one before ca. 1700. Much the same applies to the sizable body of American historians. Interest in West European history, including British, is commonly nourished by an interest in the prehistory of the North American continent, a concern which would take few people back beyond 1600. However, in any case, this distribution (which is pretty consistent throughout the Ontario universities) does not differ much from what would be found in the United States and in the newer institutions of Europe too. Nevertheless, we feel compelled to draw attention to the weaknesses of a situation which seems to limit history to the last 250 years. Recent history, itself one of the most difficult, disorganized and problematic sectors of the discipline (for good reasons: it takes time to sort out the materials and the problems), suffers when it is seen too much in its own terms, and no school of history can be considered adequate which cuts off the last few

centuries from their predecessors. When the specialists in medieval and early-modern history are increasingly treated as fringe-partners or even freaks, and when study concentrates on the highly a-typical industrial societies of recent times, historical perspective is lost and the virtues of historical comprehension become unattainable. This is bad for teachers; it is worse for students. We do not suppose that the imbalance can at present be much redressed, but we would urge that at least it should not be allowed to deteriorate further. The bias towards "modernity" has certainly reached the danger point in a learned community when three-quarters of its members confine their interest in history to approximately one-twentieth of the historically knowable stretch of time.

27. The meaning of the alleged distribution by aspects (Tables VIII and X) is much more difficult to clarify because these categories are notoriously flexible and tend to be differently understood by different people. Most members of the profession agree readily on what political or military or diplomatic history may be (though even here the edges tend to get blurred), but accident and whim will play a large part in deciding whether a man calls his interests cultural or intellectual, social or economic. We therefore propose to join the figures for at least these two particular cases (though this will involve some misleading augmentation where people have solved the dilemma by laying claim to interests in both such cognate aspects). The figures for the history of science are once again distorted by the set-up at Toronto whose 0 should read 6, giving the subject a very respectable representation in the province. The small number of specialists in historiography is acceptable because this is, on the one hand, a subject ancillary to the study of history itself, and, on the other, part of intellectual history anyway. That urban history should so far command few followers is understandable because this is a new specialty; one may hope for expansion here. But that only 23 people should claim to be interested in local history is disconcerting, and we feel strongly that the important - and highly accessible - problems of the localities, treated (in the modern manner) as exemplars of general problems seen in the particular, should receive much more attention. Both research and teaching can only benefit from an increasing concern with surveyable communities whose records are readily and immediately available.

28. The most interesting fact to emerge from the analysis is that the traditional primacy of political history is being successfully challenged by the new stars of socio-economic history (which, if we accept a slightly suspect addition, just tops the table with 34%) and also by intellectual history linked with cultural concerns (16%). Admittedly, this result seems to be produced in the main by one university - York - whose faculty contain an exceptionally large non-graduate component. That is to say, at the level of graduate teaching and the production of future scholars the decline of political history is more apparent than real. At the same time, the figures for York show clearly enough that a system dominated traditionally by political historians has proved itself capable of developing in novel ways.

29. As things stand, comment is possibly superfluous and certainly problematical. We may be confronted by an exceptionally transitional situation, or we may be witnessing the end of a transformation which will really make its mark as the younger historians of today grow into positions of seniority and control. Conversations with the people involved make us believe that the second rather than the first is true. We would speculate that the rise of socio-economic history will continue and that intellectual history, served by libraries whose resources are more readily available and more easily completed than those of archives, will at least maintain the ground gained. Politics and the biographies of politicians will continue to decline as the major interest of Ontario historians. In general, we welcome this, but with two reservations. Political history is very necessary in any well ordered school of historical studies because it provides both a structural framework articulated by the passage of time (something too often lost in the more fashionable studies today) and a concern with what men do and think rather than how they exist in their circumstances (socio-economic history in particular runs the danger of dehumanizing history). And secondly, we are not persuaded that all the expressed preferences for other forms of history are really based on a sufficient acquaintance with the sophisticated methods developing in these aspects or with the serious methodological problems that beset them. We are inclined to think that many of the scholars opting for socio-economic or intellectual history need to learn more about the inwardness of their choices. Here the insulation of history departments from departments of economics or philosophy and from the historians within them is serious, and we advise urgent attention to breaking this down; the more theoretical of the latter will benefit as much from genuine intercourse as will the somewhat pragmatical among the former. There are already signs of promising exceptions: we are impressed by the demographic studies at McMaster, the significant contributions from economists, sociologists and linguists at Guelph, and the interests of junior faculty at Waterloo. We draw attention to the often hidden pitfalls of intellectual and cultural history, ambushed time and again by superficiality, which are at present exercising specialists in Britain and the United States; we do not seem to see enough awareness of them in Ontario and apprehend too ready a surrender to fashionable topics without scholarly rigour. Above all, we want to stress that all these new ways of looking at history need to meet in common action; their function should be not to develop isolated lines of their own but to reinvigorate the sort of understanding through time which has traditionally been shaped around the political life of society. One ultimate end in view should be a new political history, absorbing and containing the advances made by social and intellectual historians; and of this we see no real sign so far. Nevertheless, we would conclude this part of the analysis by expressing our satisfaction at the increasing diversification of learned interests among the historians of the province.

(e) General Comments

30. We have not only digested the details supplied but also met many teachers of history in Ontario. Comment arising out of such brief meetings must be impressionistic and could be unfair. We do, however, think that it would be useful if we were to explain our impressions - endeavouring to remain judicious if we cannot guarantee that we shall be just.

31. Taking the faculty as a whole, we liked what we saw. Historians in Ontario are a reapectable body, mainly professional in their attitudes, well qualified, fully capable of discharging their duties and fulfilling the calls that society has a right to make upon their services. We do not find many really outstanding persons among them, though when such occur their influence upon the morale of a department is immediately noticeable; but we find even fewer people who should never have been appointed. The standard in general is well above average. This impression is supported by the views of persons with more prolonged acquaintance with the situation than we can have. Everywhere, deans of arts and of graduate studies, as well as other members of the administration, declared the high esteem in which they held their history departments (sometimes making comparisons to the detriment of other departments which we do not propose to repeat). We recall only one exception to what became almost a tedious chorus of praise - one case of distinctly modified rapture, not supported by fellow administrators at the same institution. Again and again we were told that history departments caused exceptionally few head-aches, worked well and smoothly, had excellent relations with colleagues and with students, and maintained the soundest of standards. It should be emphasized that the publishing activity of Ontario historians is impressive, and that several departments are also active in editing historical journals (see para. 104). Any criticisms which we make in this report should be seen against a general conviction - which we share - that the study and teaching of history in Ontario are in a sound condition and worthy of respect. No human situation is incapable of improvement, but we did not find ourselves investigating an ailing body. If changes are required they must be careful and sensible: they will occur in a context of satisfactory activity and start from a foundation of health, not decay.

32. The most manifest general characteristic is one of conservatism. This shows itself in various ways. Virtually every member of the teaching faculty was concerned to emphasize his belief in teaching, especially the teaching of undergraduates. This is indeed a body of teachers. We can only applaud, though we were sometimes surprised (especially at York, Queen's and Western) to find that even some of the young men were not inclined to extend their concern for undergraduates into a concern for graduate students as well. That is to say, they were content to leave advanced teaching to others. The universities of the province all started as instruments of general education and continue to be very

active in this; hence a preoccupation with undergraduates is both laudable and somewhat conservative. We hope that it may prove possible to develop graduate programs without affecting the quality of undergraduate teaching; experience elsewhere supports this hope. But at any rate, we found no department corrupted by the attitude which puts the claims of a man's "own work" above his duty to students (though very occasionally we met this attitude in individuals). Even the few specialist centres (see paras. 107-12), often in other disciplines the breeding ground of dangerously narcissistic tendencies, do not countervail this impression. We can see no sign that what may be called the Californian disease has got any sort of footing in the history departments of the province.

33. Conservatism also shows itself in the continued weight given to traditional preoccuptions with Canadian history, political history, and the conventional methods of historical study. We should be more troubled by this if the signs of new interests and better diversification were not so manifest. We are in fact troubled by it on occasion. Thus Queen's seems to us inclined to complacency rather than conservatism, and Western and York seem disinclined to make full use of their varied resources. We would urge such departments to remember that the pursuit of traditional studies and functions above all requires constant freshness to remain alive, and that that freshness can be obtained without the hunt for novelties and gimmicks they so rightly deplore. While appreciating the special causes for depression, we regret that Trent should wish to freeze its present situation and sees no occasion for any sort of dynamism. Departments of history are right to be cautious and solid rather than effervescent: it is one of their roles on the academic scene. On occasion, however, they need reminding that the step from caution and solidity to intellectual apathy and stagnation is not long.

34. Even in that majority of departments which show a very active life, developments in hand are on the whole characterised by conservatism. Thus the comprehensive rebirth which has taken place at Ottawa concentrated on preserving and advancing traditional virtures; we think that the department has been wise in its priorities and successful in carrying them out. Only Waterloo shows unmistakably the signs of a free-wheeling situation in which new things are burgeoning. The innovations at Carleton rest upon preparations so careful that, in the view of others as well as ourselves, the department could easily have moved much faster and somewhat farther without any risk of losing control or quality. Similarly, Lakehead and Laurentian, justly anxious to develop, have taken their time and secured every position on the line of advance in ways which strike us as sensible, even though an approximation to snail's pace has its frustrating side. Better this, however, than the selfadvertising clamour of certain other disciplines.

35. It is plain that on the whole we regard this prevailing conservatism as sound and fruitful. But we wish to stress that there are moments and circumstances, even in the study and teaching of history,

when radical departures are called for. This is especially true for graduate programs, the growing point of the discipline. Here the kind of devotion proper to undergraduate teaching, and the normal care taken to prepare every inch of the ground, can prove needlessly stultifying and inhibiting. Here experiments and enterprise of the more imaginative sort are urgently called for. A time of increasing stringency is not the best time for advocating energetic advance, though it can prove to be a time when only dynamic action can preserve a momentum that in good times comes by itself. We want to see the hints of growth and change further developed. We should like to see younger men given an increasing part to play in graduate programs. The faculty should not regard the present situation, which gives grounds for satisfaction, as anything but a chance to advance to better things still - higher standards, greater productivity, the exploitation of all methods, new or tried, in promoting the understanding of the past. Canadian history and the Canadian profession of historians are still in measure battling towards levels attained by the subject and its practitioners elsewhere. The materials exist of libraries and archives, of teachers and students; let them be used to the full.

(B) Graduate Students

(a) Numbers (Tables XI-XV)

36. In 1972/73 the total number of graduate students (MAs and PhDs) in the province, in history, was 774 (Table XIII). In addition there were 95 ABDs (persons who have completed all requirements except the doctoral dissertation) and 16 candidates for the rare degree of MPhil. These last two categories will here be ignored because they make no measurable demand upon graduate instruction by the faculty. The figure of 774 marks an increase of about 30% since 1968/69, but this increase has not been steady. After a sudden upswing in 1969/70, further additions became quite small, and the last year in fact registered a decline of nine, or 1.15%, too small a percentage to be significant. Nevertheless it should be noted that the growth of graduate studies in history looks as if it has come to an end; even if it resumes, the rate of growth will be minimal.

37. This number of students is considerable even when it is distributed over fourteen institutions. We must therefore emphasize that we found all departments using stringent standards for admission. No students are admitted anywhere without at least a B+ standard in their major undergraduate subjects, and applications remain sufficient to enable departments usually to operate on even higher requirements. At Waterloo (we were told) the department looks for "at least an A-", though it is hard to see what in that case they would hope to find at most. We do not mean to suggest that a B+ guarantees absolute excellence, but we are agreed that in terms of the Ontario university

system the criteria used in selecting graduate students in history are impeccable. This view is shared by the university administrators whom we interviewed: it was universally held that history departments maintain a standard of admissions superior to that generally employed. Rather than trying to grow large at the expense of quality, they all prefer to remain relatively small and selective. The files of rejected applications (some of which we saw) proved almost without exception to be self-explanatory.

38. The total number is made up of 436 MA students and 338 PhD students. There has been a slight but encouraging shift in the proportions between the two in the last five years, from 1.42 MAs to one PhD to the present relationship of 1.26:1. This suggests a growing seriousness in the program: not only are there far more graduate students but a higher proportion of them enters for the full-scale enterprise. On the other hand, the fact that in the same time ABDs have doubled in number indicates either a disquieting increase in the total of students who find it difficult to complete the course before seeking employment, or a shift in behaviour presumably conditioned by job prospects.

39. The figures for part-time students, on the other hand, suggest no improvement. For MAs, the proportion increased markedly from 40.4% to 49%; for PhDs (where it includes unfinished PhDs that started full-time, a distressing aspect of the situation) it has remained steady at just over 33%. These are really very high figures, at least from an absolute point of view. Half of Ontario's candidates for master's degrees, and one-third of the province's intending doctors, are not pure students. The largest programs appear most ready to admit part-timers. Ottawa has more part-time students than full-time in both sectors of the program; Queen's manages this for the MA; Toronto's total of part-time PhD candidates is higher than the provincial average. The situation needs serious thought (see para. 152). It appears that a very large part of those called by the name are not strictly graduate students under constant instruction and supervision, though they receive enough of both to be counted into the assessment here. The fact that so many students work part-time also affects, it must be remembered, the ultimate test of the system, the number of degrees awarded. One can set reasonable limits to the length of time taken by full-time students, part-timers notoriously take much longer and are much more likely to fail to complete the course. We reserve comment and recommendations till later.

(b) Degrees Awarded

40. Table XVI shows what has happened about the successful completion of courses. In 1972/73 205 students obtained the degree they were seeking, 67 more than in 1968/69. The percentage increase (32.4%) is slightly higher than that for total numbers registered, but the figures are so close (and ABDs come untraceably into the total of persons

finishing while being omitted from the total of persons registered) that it would seem best to conclude that the increase of successful students has simply kept pace with the increase in student numbers. Some improvement appears for both kinds of degree. The proportion of MA degrees granted to students registered has risen from 37% to 42%, while for the PhD the figures have doubled to 7%. This last figure also shows up a point which calls for explanation. So many doctoral candidates and so few degrees can mean several things, including the virtual failure of programs to bring students to the desired conclusion. Is this the case? Or are we faced with the consequences of so many part-time students, and no more? Part of the answer is certainly that several new programs are still pushing first-generation students towards the promised goal. We are not able to answer these questions conclusively, but we shall show (para. 46) that we do not regard the programs as having failed, while in Section II (D,b) we shall consider the undoubted fact that PhDs take very long to finish. Several causes operate, and some of them no doubt differently in different institutions. But it is worth noting that while at first sight an overall increase in numbers (for the PhD) by 73% in conjunction with a 100% increase in degrees awarded displays an encouraging trend, when the first means 338 heads and the second only 73 one begins to feel misgivings.

(c) Distribution by Universities (Tables V, XV, XVI)

41. Even allowing for the fact that some departments do not yet offer the PhD degree, the distribution of graduate students between the universities is very uneven. Toronto, with one-fifth of all MA candidates and nearly half of all PhD candidates, obviously stands out. But there are some other places with a good share of the supply, such as Ottawa, which attracts a sixth of all MA students, or Queen's which harbours nearly a fifth of potential PhDs. These three universities between them in fact account for 57% of all the graduate students in the province. Waterloo has 9%, McMaster and Western have 7% each; the remaining 20% divide between four departments still concerned with a measurable share (Carleton, Guelph, Windsor and York) and five departments barely or not at all involved in the work (Brock, Lakehead, Laurentian, Trent, Wilfrid Laurier).

42. Uneven distribution is what one would expect, in view of the fact that some institutions have only very recently begun to develop this side of their work. The relatively high standing of Waterloo is so far based on MA students, while York has concentrated on PhDs; both these departments are capable in the future of acquiring a larger share of both totals. One of the most significant figure in all this welter is that which shows that Toronto and York between them already have 56% of all PhD candidates, a predominance which could develop into a near-monopoly, for reasons discussed in para. 43.

Nevertheless, there is solid strength in other places, and the most sensible conclusion from these percentages is that at present at least the predominance of Toronto/York has still left several other important centres of graduate studies. Ottawa and Queen's in particular, with a quarter of all students attending there, create a firm counterbalance in the east, while Western preserves the existence of graduate studies at the other end of the province.

43. With some striking exceptions, the various departments match their share of senior graduate faculty well enough to their share of graduate students (Table V). York, with 12%, serves only 5.4% of the students. This at first looked to us like the temporary result of recent expansion, but we are surprised to find that it is intended to be permanent policy. We cannot agree that this intention can or should be fulfilled. It ought to be expected that the powerful faculty there collected will before long attract a higher proportion of students who ought to be admitted. If so, York may first affect its giant neighbour, for Toronto has a low ratio of teachers to students (1:6, compared with York's 1:1.8 and a provincial average of 1:4.3). The other large graduate schools do not do so well either: at Ottawa the ratio is just under 1:6 and at Queen's even a disturbing 1:8.3. On the face of it, it therefore looks as though a student would get the best attention if he went to one of the smaller departments, but this is a misleading and mechanical inference. Once again we must note the presence at Toronto of an unaccounted for, extra-departmental, element; and while calculations based on only full and associate professors among graduate faculty give the most accurate picture of quality, they distort by omitting a few junior teachers. When all the figures are so relatively small, one or two or three persons omitted here or there affect the result. This is quite apart from the fact that the student/teacher ratio is not the only criterion by which to judge a school: variety of interests matters greatly, and even mere size is important because a graduate program with very few students in it will lack the mutual stimulation among students which contributes so greatly to the success of the work. The manifest pull of Toronto owes less to mere numbers of teachers there than to its well-established reputation. We conclude that Toronto, Ottawa, Western, Waterloo and McMaster are large or sizable graduate schools, reasonably but not lavishly provided with teachers; that Queen's belongs to the same category but needs to enlarge the graduate faculty (perhaps by bringing more of the available teachers into the program); that York needs immediately to expand its intake of graduate students if it is to justify its large faculty; and that the remainder make a useful, if occasionally token, contribution more important in giving the department the necessary advanced dimension than in producing higher degrees in quantity.

44. We return to degrees awarded (Table XVI). With one exception, the top departments dominate this scene, too. Toronto, in particular, which has consistently over the last five years turned out about one-

quarter of all advanced students graduating in history, here justifies its recognized eminence. Western and Waterloo (the latter with so far no PhDs and only four years of MA production) between them make up about another quarter. Western has, in one way, a remarkable record: in charge of only one-twentieth of PhD students it has over five years awarded not far short of one-fifth of PhD degrees. This is the sort of efficiency that counts. York's low figures again reflect the youth of the program, but also again emphasize the disproportionate size of its faculty on present showing. More disconcerting are the figures for Ottawa and Queen's. Ottawa had nearly one-tenth of all registered PhD students in 1972/73 and, fairly enough, awarded one-eighth of PhD degrees in that year; but it also had 16.7% of MA students and turned out only just over 10% of MAs. Queen's did worse: of PhDs it taught nearly one-fifth but turned out only one-eighth, of MAs it taught a twelfth and produced less than one-eighteenth. It is evidently in these relatively large graduate programs that we must seek one cause of the discrepancy between students registered and degrees obtained. The picture is further affected by the existence in some places of the MA degree without dissertation, a point on which we shall comment later (paras. 72, 74). While Queen's shows signs of contracting, Ottawa's achievement was materially better in the last year than ever before; we believe that this is another sign of the recent revival taking effect. Nevertheless, over the years Ottawa has been distinguished by a relatively high intake of students and a relatively low rate of degrees awarded, and even though the most recent comparisons are encouraging the department needs to take cognizance of the facts and consider what should be done. Do admission standards need jacking up? Is there an unusual number of drop-outs or throw-outs? We have neither the information nor the time to investigate the problem, which in any case is one for the department to study. Ottawa needs also to consider that its recovery of excellence may find a rival in Carleton which has shown itself capable of a remarkable increase in the number of MAs produced and is now about to enter the PhD stakes, too.

45. We do not wish to labour these points too much. Obviously, there are differences between departments worth drawing attention to, and some things suggest themselves when one looks at the figures of students at work and degrees awarded. But without comparisons with other departments in the province, and history departments elsewhere, it is not possible to say whether these discrepancies are entirely normal or entirely peculiar; and we have no means for making such comparisons. Absolute figures are perhaps more significant, and we will look first at the sparse information we have on the failure rate. It is sparse because details on drop-outs especially are hard to establish. We use total figures supplied, based on the annual evidence of students disappearing from the previous year's registration without having passed or failed. These show that in the four years 1968-72, 129 MA students and 64 PhD students dropped out; at the same time, 37 of the former failed outright and 10 of the latter. Allowing for the extreme roughness of such figures, it would appear that an average of about 7% of MA students and about 4.8% of PhD students each year

found themselves unable to proceed; while of the first an annual average of 2% failed, of the second an annual average of less than 1%. In both degree courses the number of drop-outs increased noticeably in the last year, no doubt as a result of the expansion which drew in more students with insufficient means or motivation. These seem to us really very low figures, the failure rate in particular being thoroughly creditable. Insofar as the evidence goes of those who did not last the pace, history graduate programs in the province look very healthy.

46. Much the same conclusions emerge from a study of the system's positive successes. We have already said that the total of graduate students has held up very well: the increase of the period of expansion has shown no real sign yet of even beginning to disappear. Students continue to want to undertake advanced work in history, and proportionately more of them mean by this the PhD than the relatively intermediate MA. The total of advanced graduates produced is also impressive, and it too suggests a steady increase and a shift towards the PhD. Here quinquennial figures are certainly more valuable than annual ones which are readily distorted by the accident of a few people taking more or less time over their dissertations. In the last five years (Table XVI) the province has turned out 751 MAs and 109 PhDs in history, a really striking achievement. (We understand that the total Canadian production of PhDs in sociology since 1964, i.e. in ten years, is about 40, though 28 of these graduated in the last two years.) In sum, the history graduate programs are not underproductive, nor (when comparison is made with the teaching strength available in other social sciences) are the graduate faculty underemployed. If we suppose that the graduate faculty (now 226 strong) has averaged about 190 over the last five years, we arrive at the conclusion that on average every professor has produced close to five higher degrees, a very respectable record.

(d) Sources of Student Supply and Support

47. History graduate students in Ontario universities are overwhelmingly Canadian (Table XVII). Only 94 are landed immigrants and 58 foreigners on student visas. Interestingly enough, the highest proportion of these last is found among full-time PhD students (where they supply 14%), an indication that the Ontario programs attract outsiders at the top of the program rather than lower down. In general, and overwhelmingly among MAs, the universities here serve native needs. This is only what one would expect.

48. Over all, graduate students support themselves in all the usual ways (Table XVIII). 73 (15.5%) rely on their own or their parents' means; about twice that number (142) depend on scholarship money, above

all Canada Council Fellowships. Those wholly supported by Ontario Graduate Fellowships are few - a mere 26. The majority, however, depend on some form of assistantship, mostly teaching, with or without scholarship money: 184, or just under 40%. There is also a very small number of students (24) who are supported as research assistants. What does emerge is the outstanding role of teaching assistantships in maintaining graduate students in their studies. Of course, the teaching assistantship is a well entrenched institution in the North American system, being the product of insufficient numbers of teachers and of the principle that students will endeavour to work their way through college. It has, however, very serious disadvantages which, though usually recognized by those with whom we discussed the point, are nevertheless allowed to exist. At its best, it makes very serious demands on a student's time and energy; it distracts his thoughts and prolongs the time taken over the degree. At its worst - when courses are entrusted to students - it may do harm to both graduate and undergraduate work. We are glad to report that we generally found a responsible attitude in this matter. History departments do not use teaching assistants to lecture to freshmen courses, or indeed to any courses, but strictly to assist course lecturers as tutors and leaders of discussion groups. This practice is usually justified on the ground that it helps the beginner to gain some teaching experience, and that there is something in this may also be deduced from the fact that many graduate students believe the experience to be valuable. We do not believe that the argument justifies the massive interference with a student's first concern - his study and research - which results from his being employed in teaching. The most convincing argument for continuing the practice rests in the fact that but for it too many students would be without financial support. That, no doubt, is true, but should it be? Should research training be financed so overwhelmingly by this means? While some teaching experience during the course of a student's graduate program may well be desirable, the necessity for a student to teach for three or even four years during the course of his or her graduate training must certainly be seriously questioned. (We note with some alarm that at Toronto, for example, there are some teaching assistants who are in their fifth and sixth years of a PhD program.) It is certainly the case that the extreme length of PhD programs in history (on which we comment in paras. 87-88) is at least partly caused by the fact that students must devote a great deal of their time to teaching duties. What we would like to see is a judicious combination of scholarship and teaching assistant support. Thus, in a three-year PhD program, a student might have scholarship support in his first and third years, but get some teaching experience in the second year. We must also note that the system as it is now operated makes it possible for some graduate students, usually the best ones, to get soholarship support throughout their graduate careers, while others must spend a disproportionate amount of time on teaching duties which, after a year or so, become simply chores that must be performed out of financial necessity but add little to the scholarly growth of the performer. A fuller system of support by scholarships is manifestly

preferable. We especially commend the work of the Canada Council, and we suggest that the province could do more in support of graduate students.

49. The policies governing financial support of graduate students are by no means uniform across the province. Considerable differences exist from place to place. Some universities (e.g. Guelph, McMaster, Ottawa, Waterloo) make a commitment of continuing financial support to students who perform satisfactorily; Queen's and Western do in general give continuing financial support to their students, although they make no formal commitment from year to year; at Toronto, continuing support is by no means assured, and (though student numbers have not declined) there has been a decline in the number of fellowships available and a ceiling has been placed on funds available for teaching assistantships. Lakehead and Wilfrid Laurier, which offer only the MA, attempt to support graduate students for one year; Windsor, on the other hand, has not had a strong support program for its MA students. The department there does not use teaching assistants, and until last year there was little money available for scholarships. To overcome some of these disadvantages, the University of Windsor introduced a scholarship scheme last year that should go some way towards rectifying this situation. We note also that most of the departments make some money available to enable graduate students to spend some time working in archives, mostly in Toronto and Ottawa.

50. It is particularly important for the smaller universities to have a good support program if they are to attract and keep their share of very good students. We note that there is now a good deal of concern, particularly in the smaller centres, about the effect which the new policy of the so-called portable Ontario Government Fellowships is going to have. There is a feeling that the best students, once they receive these fellowships, will tend to go to the older and more established universities. It is, of course, too early to say whether this will in fact happen. Since the universities which have only recently introduced graduate work have a good deal to offer to students, it need not happen, and we hope that it will not. But the effects of the new policy should certainly be carefully watched.

51. In those universities in which graduate students cannot be sure that financial support will be continued we found, not surprisingly, a good deal of anxiety among the students who spoke to us. We would recommend that a commitment should be made to students: if their academic work is satisfactory, they should have the assurance that they will be supported in their doctoral program for a set number of years (at least three and preferably four), which would give them a reasonable chance of completing their work and getting the degree. Departments in their turn would have to be given assurance that they could count on a certain number of Ontario Government Fellowships, and where the universities themselves support students out of their own operating revenues they should make commitments to students who have started on their doctoral programs and continue to make satisfactory progress. In this way, at least one of the sources of anxiety to which graduate students are inevitably subject could be eliminated.

Students should in any case be given a clear statement of what they might reasonably expect in the way of financial support. Too often at present the policies governing long-range support are not precisely set down, and there is therefore danger of misunderstanding and conflict between departments and their students.

52. Finally, we note the views of a number of deans who feel that financial support for students in the humanities and social sciences is not really adequate and still lags considerably behind that available in the sciences. One dean felt that a graduate student should have at least $4000 p.a. in order to sustain himself, but he noted that such support was simply not possible for the majority of students. It ought, however, at least to be a goal to be striven towards.

(e) Employment

53. Table XIX shows the present employment of completed PhD students and of those who, having done all the work except the dissertation, have left the nest (ABDs). Only the figure for 1972/73 is really large enough to deserve analysis and yield meaningful information. The proportion of ABDs (95) in the total of 115 is very high, which suggests that the pattern of employment is unlikely to change in the immediate future. The majority (about 65%) have entered university teaching, dividing themselves approximately evenly between Ontario and the rest of Canada, with a very few elsewhere. Taking the last five years together, the percentage is higher (69.5%): as the table shows, it is only very recently that any considerable numbers have found employment outside the universities, especially in government of whose fourteen recruits ten joined during the last year. We have no figures for finished MAs, but from what we were able to learn by enquiry we would guess that the bulk of them will be found in school-teaching and in civil service situations.

54. The dominance of the university market is not, of course, surprising: the chief function of the PhD degree everywhere is to train university teachers. Ontario universities have recruited marginally fewer of their own products than have the remaining universities of Canada; this again was to be expected because Ontario produces the largest number of PhDs of any province and therefore naturally acts as a source of supply elsewhere. The real problem lies in the future. Everyone is agreed that the market is now very adverse: with the period of expansion at a probable end, and with so many posts filled by recent and therefore youthful recruits, vacancies are going to be few. This is likely to have two effects: PhDs will stand a better chance of academic employment if they specialize in an area in which expansion is still possible (see para. 154 below), and PhDs will increasingly have to rely on other employers. Government service evidently comes highest on the list, and history PhDs will have to

apply themselves more determinedly to that market. By this we do not mean only the obvious jobs (museums, archives, libraries) but also posts in ordinary administration; and we would emphasize that a fully trained history PhD is a man (and woman) useful in any post requiring judgment, adaptability and attention to detail. The other untapped area is industry which has so far shown little interest in history PhDs, or alternatively managed to interest only one such in entering it. We cannot tell whether this abysmal figure reflects reluctance on the part of potential employer or employee, but we have learned from experience that few trained historians anywhere have so far been willing to go into industry. The pressures of the market will probably change such attitudes; there is certainly room for the capacities of highly trained historians in the affairs of companies and factories.

55. Despite the gloom which hangs over the future, however, it should be emphasized that the present position is not bad at all. The total of PhDs known to remain unemployed is only seven (6%), and of these four have only just entered the search for a job. The vast majority of the students in question have found employment, and most of them in the work they want - academic teaching. Even though this includes a significant number of people whose employment at present is temporary, this is a satisfactory record, especially when one remembers that the period of stringency (the world over) really began some two years ago. These facts support the opinions expressed to us by faculty members who, while foreseeing great difficulties in the future, very generally told us that so far they had managed to find posts for just about every one of their PhD students. Up till now, therefore, the programs may be said to have worked well. The market is not swamped with PhDs; rather, production of students has kept well in step with job prospects. The increase in graduate students has been managed responsibly and successfully.

(f) General Comments

56. We have seen some, but not of course even the majority, of graduate students at present at work in the province, and we rather regret that in the massive materials collected for us there were no written statements from students. We well know the care required in evaluating such memorials, but we think we should have found them useful. Impressions derived from necessarily short conversations with such a casual sample will not bear the load of very searching interpretations, but when such conversations produce fairly standard answers one may feel justified in forming an opinion. We therefore think it desirable that we should say something about the attitudes, purposes and states of mind revealed in those discussions.

57. The quality of students naturally varied a good deal, not only because it was bound to do so but also because there is a difference between beginners and the more advanced men and women. The latter tend to talk more and better. Our general impressions were favourable. We found much liveliness, vigour, ease of manner, serious intellectual interest - though we must stress that the circumstances of our interviews amounted to a natural selection of the brighter and more enterprising spirits. By the standards of international scholarship, outstanding performances are few, but the general level is good. The one disquieting aspect in a generally quite happy picture was the widespread feeling of isolation, even loneliness. We recognize that this is an occupational disease for history students everywhere and we know of no infallible remedy. However, there are things that can be done to bring students into closer contact with one another, irrespective of their subject of research. Some of them require initiatives from the students themselves of which we saw too few examples: one wants to see more student-promoted historical societies or social occasions. Teachers can assist by providing more general colloquia or discussion-meetings, and administration can help by supplying common rooms which for the students in question exist hardly anywhere. The usual remedies are well known; we would emphasize that with the increase in numbers the need is now very real and should be attended to.

58. We were in general well satisfied with such evidence as we could obtain of the relations between faculty and students. On the surface, relations were invariably good, and even in private most students expressed themselves as pleased with the treatment they were getting. Hardly anyone complained of inadequate access to professors. The atmosphere was particularly and pleasingly relaxed at Waterloo; but at McMaster we encountered the only express dissatisfaction, derived from the fact that while access was easy enough it seemed only to bring the student into the presence of persons felt to be "aloof". We do not lay much stress on these occasional personality conflicts. The statistical norm would be expected to be higher than the incidence found. At Windsor, the ever open doors of faculty offices were expressly praised. (Some of us feel that ever open doors can signify an excessive willingness on the part of faculty members to neglect their own research, and this is a valid criticism of the North American attitude to office doors!) Even at Ottawa, with its large numbers, the students can only be said to have enthused over their contacts with their teachers. Signs of inadequacy in these respects are usually readily apparent: we saw very few indeed. At the graduate level, departments manage to create in the main the atmosphere of an academic community working together in a common enterprise.

59. Opinions as to the teaching received varied rather more, but this is so subjective an issue that we cannot reduce it to a summary

statement. Some teachers are better at handling graduate students; some are more demanding than others; students react differently and vary enormously in their receptivity for instruction and guidance. We heard some criticism of mechanical teaching and of inadequate handling of written work submitted, but we came across no genuine disasters. At the same time, we ourselves feel that while the instruction provided during the more formal stages of the course is generally good that offered after the student has passed his qualifying examinations leaves something to be desired. This point is discussed more fully below (para. 94).

60. We tried to discover how satisfied students were with the organization of their studies. Once more, approval was more manifest than criticism, with one exception. MA students in general seemed content to do what was asked of them, those whose studies included a dissertation feeling both more excited and more hard-pressed. PhD students were at one about the virtues of actual research, but more divided about the course work and field study asked of them. Few seemed to think that they should be allowed to do nothing but a dissertation; there was general agreement that some measure of wider study was desirable. But we encountered criticism of the degree to which courses were dominated by this wider study. There was some feeling that those who had completed the MA should not have to revert to quite so much extraneous work during their PhD studies, and the comprehensive examinations came under responsible attack. We shall discuss this problem below (paras. 89, 92).

61. Why do Ontario students pursue graduate studies? Those entering for terminal MAs seem to contain a high proportion for whom the chief purpose is professional advancement - the chance of a better job. But even among them one finds many whose real concern, at this juncture, is to improve their understanding of history: they are simply interested in their studies and especially in the research aspect of them. Among PhD candidates this was, we found, the predominant attitude. Pressed about their future, most replied that they would want to do what they were doing irrespective of job prospects. Most admitted that their ambitions concentrated on academic employment, but they usually added that they fully understood the situation and were willing to find work elsewhere - anywhere remotely suitable. In any case, they tended to say, job or no job - they wished to study history at an advanced level and train themselves to handle evidence and analysis. Only at one place was student comment on this topic dominated by understandable bitterness and grave doubt whether they would have come in if they had known beforehand how the market was going to develop. Most reactions were much more resigned. These manifestly sincere attitudes are encouraging. It was good to see that for the better students the intellectual purposes of their work came a long way first; and it is good to know that students are aware of, and ready to exploit, the non-academic employments which, as we have seen (para. 54) so far remain insufficiently explored. We conclude that the narrowing of academic prospects will have only minor effects upon the desire to enter graduate programs in history, and that an increasing number of history PhDs will find other work satisfactory to themselves. We do not wish to sound complacent, but we cannot find it in our hearts to talk in terms of crisis.

(C) MA Programs

(a) General

62. With the exception of Brock, every university either offers or intends to offer the degree of MA in history.* There are thus fourteen institutions in the province at which a student may advance to this level. He may wish to use it as a step towards the PhD, but (as student numbers indicate: para. 38) a high proportion treat the MA as a terminal degree. If the present dearth of academic posts continues, it is quite likely that this proportion may again increase, and there are signs that more schoolteachers may return to the university in order to gain the higher qualification which brings advancement in their job. Some institutions have also discovered a demand from quite unexpected sources - middle-aged people dissatisfied with the work of the professions or of business - which they are rightly anxious to satisfy. We believe that the terminal MA is an important aspect of the work of the Ontario history departments and are therefore concerned to see its standards and reputation maintained.

63. One importance of all these MA programs lies in the fact that they provide the only graduate dimension at several universities (Lakehead, Laurentian, Trent, Wilfrid Laurier, Windsor). As was said above, we regard that dimension as essential to the health of a department (para. 11). We therefore welcome the efforts made at the smaller institutions to expand into MA programs and regret the failure of Brock so far to follow suit.

64. The smaller and more isolated universities - especially Lakehead and Laurentian - have an additional responsibility in that they can offer advanced work to people (particularly schoolteachers) who, wishing to improve their scholarly qualifications, can do so only if they are not forced to take leave from their employment or to travel far for their studies. There is here a kind of neighbourhood service which may well have to rely on very limited resources in manpower and libraries but is nevertheless of great use locally. Certainly the opportunities so offered are appreciated, and we would deprecate any steps which, in the interests of economy or rationalization, would reduce the ability of small departments to benefit academically both themselves and their catchment area. At the same time, we would expect such institutions to concentrate on the purposes described and to devise regulations flexible enough for the needs of the kind of student for whom they are most immediately useful. This does not mean lowering standards: on the contrary. But it does mean allowing for the fact that the bulk of the students involved are likely to be part-time.

65. In larger institutions, which operate solid PhD programs, there is always a danger that the MA will be treated as a poor relation - even sometimes as a consolation prize for those who fail the higher degree. Fortunately the regulations of the universities under review

* Brock does not exclude the prospect of offering the degree in due time.

prevent this disaster. It is, in fact, clear to us that all departments, including those that devote much time and energy to doctoral candidates, continue to emphasize the importance of the master's degree in their curricula and in the faculty's concerns. MA students receive full and proper attention.

66. The degree is therefore entirely alive and well wherever it is offered; the question remains whether it maintains its proper purposes and standards.

(b) Structure of the Degree

67. We encountered one unexpected difficulty in our enquiries. Departments use a variety of terms to describe practices that may be the same, and sometimes identical terms for what turn out to be sufficiently different practices. Even the term "course" means different things in different places, while "term papers", "research seminars", "long papers", and even "classes" carried the most unpredictable connotations. We quite understand that the individualism of the scholar resists perfect standardization even of terminology, but historians in Ontario should be aware that their teaching habits differ more widely than the language of official catalogues might suggest. Grand sounding descriptions too often turn out under investigation to hide quite humble practices of only moderate educational usefulness. But, above all, we must preface all further remarks on the MA with a blanket apology for possibly misjudging this or that program on the grounds that we could not fathom what exactly was involved in the work allegedly required. We could have learned fully what was going on only by spending a term in each department and reading dozens of students' papers. Fortunately there was no time for that.

68. All departments base the work for the MA on regular courses, formally taught. At Carleton, McMaster, Western and Windsor it is possible to take the MA solely by such course work and by examination on i , without any original writing. Four courses are required, McM ster will allow the substitution of a dissertation for two of their four courses only in exceptional circumstances.

69. Oddly enough, only Lakehead and Trent seem to know no MA without dissertation; for practical purposes, Guelph also insists on the dissertation though provision exists for obtaining the degree without one. McMaster and Waterloo permit the presentation of a dissertation on rare occasions. Carleton, which allows it to students of Canadian history, demands it of all other MA candidates. The remaining departments all allow the degree to be obtained in this fashion, usually asking for two courses in addition to the original work. The exceptions are Guelph (four semester courses, two of them in historiography), Lakehead (three courses) and Toronto whose demand for four half-year courses in effect amounts to the standard two.

70. Many institutions offer a compromise between pure course work and course work plus dissertation by asking for course work accompanied by some form of lengthy essay or seminar paper, though five departments (Carleton, Lakehead, McMaster, Trent, Western) do not admit this method at all. It is especially popular at Wilfrid Laurier. The number of courses required is usually three (one more than when a dissertation is offered), but Guelph and Ottawa call for four, while Toronto demands five instead of four of its half-courses. Western permits an odd intrusion from the PhD degree by granting MA degrees on comprehensive examinations in three fields; this is presumably designed to assist intending PhDs.

71. This confused situation contains within it some disturbing aspects. The MA degree is a gruaduate degree and must clearly be seen to differ in purpose and structure from undergraduate work. The most obvious way to achieve this is by demanding a dissertation. The MA dissertation is rightly thought of as relatively short (not more than 100 pages), restricted in scope, often based on work only in printed sources and still quite dependant on secondary materials. At the same time, to be a dissertation, it should call for some original powers in the student (research, synthesis, rethinking, assessment). We have only modest means of judging the quality of dissertations being done at this level, but so far as one can tell from titles submitted, from discussions with faculty and students, and from a quick glance at some samples, we are satisfied that departments in general keep the proper characteristics of this kind of work well in mind. The MA courses which include a dissertation are sound in structure and achieve the necessary purpose of the degree by turning out advanced students.

72. However, by the same token we must call in question all MA degrees obtained without a dissertation. Most MAs in Canadian history from Carleton, and virtually at MAs from McMaster, have reached their status in this way, and it seems problematical whether they can be regarded as anything more than over-developed undergraduates - holders of a better first degree than the BA. No doubt their work has been more demanding and somewhat more profound than would be expected of undergraduates, but it has been much the same in kind. McMaster, for instance, demands "research papers" in each course studied and believes that these compensate for the absence of a dissertation. However, the meaning of "research" apart, a student who thus produces some thirty or forty thousand words in four disconnected bits (and many write far less) is not undergoing the experience of the student who has had to organize some 60,000 words on one theme; and we cannot subscribe to the department's opinion. Western and Windsor at least regularly permit students to attempt dissertations, but still award the degree regularly to some who have not done so. At Western, where alone we got figures, 13 students in 1972 opted for the dissertation against 12 for course work only; for 1973 the numbers are 24 and 10.

This shows an encouraging willingness to tackle the harder and more rewarding road, but still leaves so many people in the courses-only sector that the high production of MAs at that institution (para. 44) begins to look rather less impressive.*

73. The compromise method of course work plus a special paper short of a dissertation has superficial attractions. It demands a little more of a student than he did as an undergraduate and permits a test of his personal abilities. At Wilfrid Laurier, we were persuaded, this (the most popular) method is working well. Nevertheless, we sympathize with the institutions (Carleton, McMaster and Western) that eschew the compromise. There are always problems in deciding what length and standard of such an essay should satisfy the requirement, and the extra course work imposed severely limits the time available for this one truly graduate aspect of the student's work. We do not think the compromise as satisfactory as its widespread use would suggest it is held to be in the Ontario universities.

74. The justification commonly offered for retaining methods alternative to course work plus dissertation are three. It is argued, first, that the inclusion of a dissertation invariably prolongs the time taken over the degree; while most institutions expect the student to finish in one year (more usually a calendar than an academic year), they know that dissertation students can be safely predicted to need eighteen months. Secondly, it is held that many candidates, and especially those working for the terminal MA, wish to improve their knowledge across a spread of subjects because their profession (schoolteaching in particular) or their educational ends call for this. And thirdly, it is thought that the level of knowledge and competence obtained by Ontario's BAs is in many cases not such as to justify treating them as genuine graduate students; for them, the MA not only is a better BA but should be that. We see much weight in the first argument and a little in the other two, but they must be considered in relation to the other principles already stated. The MA degree is a graduate degree and should include a component which differs in essence from the undergraduate degree. It should develop and test a new set of abilities: building on the training given to the bachelor, it should take him further not only in mere knowledge but also in intellectual power and its use. The need for real advanced work is greatest for the terminal MA who will not encounter such things at a later stage, and for him the argument against stretching out the time taken is also least convincing: perhaps at least MAs without dissertation might be confined to students who go on to the PhD. As for the point that schoolteachers want to take courses in order to equip themselves for teaching, it should be recognized that they do not really need (in their work) the rather more solid history which MA courses provide: they do need the mental growth which original work stimulates. And

* We recognize that opinions of this non-dissertation research will differ; we have stated our views in this paragraph.

if it is true, as well it may be, that there are a number of students whose attainments as BAs do not yet qualify them to undertake real MA work, we would ask whether they have a place at all in anything properly to be called an MA program. In fact, our personal impression is that quite a few students at present working on courses only could well face the challenge of an MA dissertation, provided the scope is suitably circumscribed. We reiterate our preference for MA courses which include a compulsory dissertation, even more for terminal MAs (for whom this is the only real experience of genuine research) than for intending PhD students (who yet will benefit from a first experience most valuable in tackling the "real" dissertation later on). In consequence, we much regret the fact that nearly everywhere the signs point towards an increasing use of the less satisfactory method and would urge that this trend be reversed. If only because of the need to have some short courses available, the MA by course-work only will have to be retained, but it should become customary to make its use the occasional exception, justifiable in certain individual cases.

75. In this connection we would raise a further fundamental point. It is obviously true that different departments, and different people in one department, will teach their courses differently, and a good deal depends on the number of students taking a course. Yet we found in general that the teaching of MA courses still (and inevitably) resembled the teaching of BA courses in that the student is expected to absorb rather than contribute, to learn from a teacher rather than to learn from his own practice, however stumbling. This is inherent in all formal course work, even though teachers of genius (preferably handling small classes) may manage to break the bonds. Nor do we wish to suggest that a quantity of this kind of teaching and learning is not still appropriate to the MA student: it is. We appreciate that much of what goes on in courses is described in terms of research (seminars and papers), but, with all respect, we regard this use of the term as a form of debasement. No doubt students read selected original sources, but the time allowed and the level attained rarely justify the use of that description for work which in other places (and indeed in some Ontario universities) is regarded as perfectly suitable for undergraduates, too. We must note that these facts and their effects heavily reinforce our doubts about an MA program which relies entirely, or even in very large measure, upon taught courses.

76. To sum up: we approve all existing MA programs which include a dissertation, we hope that those that demand a shorter piece of the student's own writing will insist on its displaying real signs of the qualities one expects to find in a dissertation, and we very seriously call in doubt MAs obtained by course work only. We suggest that all departments that offer this way to the degree should reconsider their practice in the light of these comments.

(c) Areas of Study for Dissertation Work

77. Toronto supervises MA work in every one of the many subjects which

its graduate faculty practise. The only reservation to be made here is that the bias, especially in Canadian history, is towards the traditional political aspects. However, this department effectively covers the main areas of history, also through time, and for the rest of this section we concern ourselves mainly with the other departments.

78. Naturally enough, every department accepts students wishing to work in Canadian history. Waterloo and Windsor confine themselves to the period since 1759, and Lakehead for the present proposes to stick to post-Confederation history. Ottawa, true to its self-identified mission as a bridge between French and English Canada, specializes in New France and French Canada since the English conquest; elsewhere, though ostensibly all Canadian history may be offered, little work is done in the 17th and 18th centuries. Queen's, though it does not restrict itself to Canada, allows that history to predominate. Windsor, for the present content with political history, sticks to the later 19th and 20th centuries. Lists of dissertations show that departments do not believe in confining students to local subjects, but these occur.

79. British (and Imperial) history forms another solid block of course work, but far fewer students specialize in it for dissertation purposes. Lakehead, Laurentian and Ottawa do not admit it at all. Only Guelph, McMaster, Trent and Western feel able to include the middle ages; only Windsor does not go back beyond ca. 1700; the rest cover the modern period from ca. 1450 onwards.

80. American history is also widely studied - Lakehead, Laurentian and Ottawa again forming the exception. Western, Queen's and York include the colonial period; the remainder begin in 1776.

81. In European history, the west gets a good deal of attention (except at Lakehead and Laurentian). McMaster, Waterloo and Western include the middle ages, Windsor once more begins ca. 1700, the rest manage the period from ca. 1500. Courses rarely extend beyond 1945. Ottawa specializes in the history of France and concentrates on the last 150 years. Exactly what is offered, or admitted by way of dissertation subject, depends on the particular interests of the graduate faculty, which means a predominance of French history; but Queen's, Waterloo and Wilfrid Laurier promote the era of the Reformation, with particular attention to Germany. There is some interest in Renaissance Italy, almost none in Spain. Eastern Europe receives attention at Waterloo (since ca. 1500), Wilfrid Laurier and Windsor (1500-1945), and Western which begins ca. 1800.

82. Some other fields of study are offered. Ancient history makes its appearance not only at Toronto but also at McMaster and Waterloo. Asian and African history are taught at Waterloo and York, with a concentration on China and Japan; except at Toronto, there is no history of India. No fewer than four departments include courses in Latin American history (Waterloo, Western, Windsor and York). Several

departments believe in the virtues of courses in historiography, a faith not much shared by their students; Guelph and Lakehead make them compulsory (Guelph demands two!), and York has a compulsory "colloquium" in this mildly trendy subject.

83. On the face of it, therefore, the range is good, even without the all-embracing program at Toronto. Closer inspection modifies this impression without destroying it. It is, inevitably, true that the spread is much wider in course work than in the selection of dissertation topics which are heavily biased towards Canada. This, it must be noticed, increases the bias towards pretty recent history. The middle ages are not forgotten, but they receive proper treatment only at Toronto, McMaster and Western, with a little help from Guelph. In the majority of programs students have some difficulty in learning about history before the middle of the 18th century and no chance at all of going back before the Reformation. One would prefer to see a better balance of options in every department, but the situation, of course, reflects the capacity of the faculty, and this in turn has had to be chosen in the first instance for the creation of an undergraduate program suitable to Canada in the 20th century. However, since the MA depends so heavily on course work, and since this is defended on the grounds that it enables the student to deepen and broaden his knowledge of the past, we draw attention to the fact that the past about which he can learn is everywhere circumscribed by the needs of undergraduate teaching, despite the fact that the MA is supposed to take him outside and beyond that earlier experience. We believe that some established MA programs could well endeavour to vary their concerns and should occasionally make appointments in fields not yet covered. Queen's, in particular, which already has the resources, should get away from its emphasis on Canadian studies; it can, and should, further develop its interests in Britain, the USA, and selected parts of Europe. Windsor needs to look to the time-span; a department confined absolutely to modern history is very lop-sided. We except Lakehead and Laurentian from this advice because they are right to start their new programs exclusively in Canadian history; other things will come with time. But Ottawa, while distinguished by concentrating on things French, would be a better bridge between the communities if it added some English and perhaps German history to its program. It does teach these areas to undergraduates, and the reluctance of some faculty to take their interests also to MA students is to be deprecated.

84. We welcome the fact that several departments are consciously trying to develop their own specialties. Ottawa apart, that endeavour concentrates on aspects rather than regions. Queen's, for instance, practises military history, Carleton prefers social and economic history to political, Western is making an effort in the same direction, Waterloo likes to concentrate on ideas and ideology. Those departments that go outside the major areas of North America and western Europe obviously offer their own attractions to students. In the nature of

things, there are limits to what can be done: every department must include Canada and some politics, or these would not be viable programs for Canadian universities. However, there is enough variety, and enough desire to add more, to encourage hope for the future. The obvious areas of future development are eastern Europe and third world studies, especially Africa; we would like to see modest efforts here, though we see to cause to call for more courses in Latin American history.

85. It will be apparent by now that we in essence commend the present situation in which all but one department of history in the province run MA programs. Though we offer some criticism of details, we support the existence of all these programs in principle. We do so on three fundamental grounds:

(i) The need, already stressed, for a graduate program in any history department worthy of the name.

(ii) The need, proven by the numbers that come to study for the MA in every department, for so large a number of programs.

(iii) The quality of what is offered, which varies from the good to the entirely adequate.

There will always be some approximate duplication and overlapping, as well as some diversity. What matters, in our opinion, is that there should be vigorous and rigorous MA studies in history everywhere, that these should draw in the largest possible number of teaching faculty, and that they should be encouraged to develop rather than stand still. By development we do not necessarily mean expansion. We point to the need for greater variety in some departments whose non-graduate faculty could readily provide it; we point to the need to professionalize the degree by phasing out the MA by coursework only; we point to the need to treat the dissertation, and with it the student's own initiatives, with greater respect. We believe that such developments might possibly (and for a time) even reduce student numbers a little, and that certainly they call for no increase in either students or faculty. Our criticisms and suggestions are founded on the conviction that departments themselves intend to improve the level of their graduate instruction and output, seeking to attain the best international standards which are at present found fairly generally at Toronto and intermittently elsewhere. The right ambitions exist, and the degree itself is manifestly alive. It is only if the smaller departments fail to add to their stature that the predominance of Toronto/York will begin to affect their activities adversely. There is a real need for all the degrees offered, a need which further conscious improvement will only augment.

(D) PhD Programs

(a) General

86. No program exists at six universities (Brock, Lakehead, Laurentian, Trent, Wilfrid Laurier, Windsor); Carleton is about to initiate one; the remaining institutions all award PhDs in history, though some (Waterloo, York) started only very recently. Nine PhD programs in one province is a respectable, and just possibly a daunting, number, even in so well established a subject as history. Thus, teaching at the highest level is a serious preoccupation of a large part of all the faculty in history.

(b) Structure

87. The most obvious and central problem touching the PhD is the length of time it takes to complete the degree. Most departments claim to be aiming at a total of four to five years overall, but very few cases ever come near the lower limit of this timespan. At Toronto the average stretch from entry into the program to approval of the dissertation is 5.9 years, and this average is achieved by quite a few cases that run to seven or eight years. This is a situation which can be variously described as unsatisfactory, frightening or unacceptable. It becomes all three when comparisons are made with PhDs in other disciplines. One consequence is that historians condemn their students to a disadvantageous start in life, compared with natural or social scientists: when it comes to such mile-stones as the granting of tenure or promotion history professors are always likely to be noticeably older than their colleagues. Of course, there are explanations that can be offered. The PhD in history, which usually involves often distant journeys to archives and a very thorough grounding in a large area of knowledge, cannot strictly be compared with the laboratory-based, professorially-controlled and narrowly-defined research degree in, say, chemistry or physics; and the inordinate time taken clearly has to do with the fact that very many students take up full-time employment before completing their dissertations. However, the dangerous consequences of the length of time taken are too manifest to permit one to accept such excuses. Historical research will take longer than chemical, but it need not take that much longer. In future, also, it is likely that few people will get jobs, especially academic jobs, before completing the PhD, if only because for all vacancies they will find themselves competing with finished PhDs. At present far too much research and writing is done at a time of minimal contact with the teacher, and the long years of indeterminate status are enervating and frustrating. Historians should be better aware than they are of the criticism levelled from outside their own ranks against

this aspect of their work. They may regard such criticism as ill-informed, but it exists, it has good grounds, and it takes on force from the fact that an exceptionally long PhD course is an exceptionally expensive PhD course. Even if one were to accept the causes alleged as convincing, one would still have to regard the situation as requiring attention and remedy. In any case, it is apparent to us that much of the trouble lies in the present structure of the degree.

88. We may sum up what we see as the fundamental problem by saying that the history PhD in Ontario manages to combine the most time-absorbing aspects of two different systems. From the United States it takes over the predissertation stage of work in several fields with comprehensive examinations at the end. To this it has welded a dissertation requirement more like that customary in England where the degree is awarded on the dissertation alone. Though, no doubt, there are exceptions, the theses offered at most American universities are inferior in length and quality to those demanded in Ontario. Add to this the wide-spread acceptance that courses will be very long (an acceptance created by custom, by inability to see a way out, and even by a touch of selfsatisfaction at so thorough a degree course), and it is no wonder that students tend to take longer and longer before finishing. We therefore propose to review the various stages of the training provided with an eye to offering suggestions for reducing the length of time taken without touching the essential purpose and quality of the program. We believe, in fact, that our suggestions would not only cut time but also add vigour.

89. Before we turn to the problems of the first half of the course, it will be advisable to dispose of one side issue involved in it. Whatever may be said about organized courses in a master's program, they would really seem out of place in the training of doctors. All but two of the departments recognize this, but York tries to organize the study of fields around formal courses and Western demands two such as a qualification for the degree. Moreover, Toronto is planning to introduce class work into the first year of the PhD, a step which we regard as retrograde. Guelph insists on a compulsory course in historiography for PhD students who cannot show that they have undergone such instruction in their earlier existence; we can see no virtue in inflicting on advanced students a course that may just conceivably help to broaden ill-trained undergraduate minds. We should like to see all regulated courses of this kind removed from PhD programs, in recognition of the fact that in the PhD student we have an adult being who should be held capable of standing upright without such corsets.

90. For the rest, the course structure is outwardly uniform. Everywhere, candidates have to study fields on which they are formally tested in comprehensive examinations. Three fields are required at Carleton, Ottawa, Queen's, Western and York; Toronto in effect demands the same but defines one as major and two as minor. Guelph, McMaster

and Waterloo ask for one major and three minor fields.* The majority do not seem to limit choice at all (except, presumably, by the capacity of the faculty to direct reading and to examine). However, Carleton demands that one field be related to the dissertation, while Waterloo on the contrary insists that one be taken from another discipline. Ottawa combines both these conditions.

91. The chief purposes of fields of study are stated to be two: to prepare the candidate's background for his research (usually but not always in his major field), and to give him knowledge of additional areas of history to assist him if later he becomes a teacher in a university. The method is deeply entrenched in the system and finds wide support among faculty members; by and large, students too accept it as desirable. It so happens that none of us passed through this stage in our training, and we venture to think that we suffered no harm thereby, either as scholars or teachers. However, we accept that any proposal to abolish it (on the grounds that it hinders the student's proper and rapid development into a scholar capable of serious research) would be totally unacceptable, and we respect the conviction of its virtue current among so many experienced persons. Nevertheless, we suggest that its present operation needs rethinking. This stage, before the student embarks on research proper, is in great measure responsible for the overlong PhD courses in history. Whatever may be said about ambitions to get through it in one year, the fact is admitted that eighteen or twenty-four months are much more usual, and longer stretches still are not unkown. The student thus leaves residence before his dissertation is properly underway, with all the further cumulative delays resulting from that. And quite apart from the loss of time, such extended labour on what is still general history frequently proves frustrating and tends to flatten the student's zest for the work. In our opinion no student should take more than one calendar year <u>at most</u> in completing this stage, and we make the following points designed to achieve this:

(i) The number of fields required is generally too large. Four is certainly too many, and we have doubts about three. There is a good case for demanding two only, to be treated as equal in importance. At least they will receive proper attention, which is rarely the case with a fourth field. A person offering two sizable areas of historical knowledge is capable of discharging such teaching duties as it is proper to put upon the beginner, a point made even more cogent by recent developments. Most of the faculty now at work started in small departments where everybody had to be something of a maid of all work. The recent expansion has created a different set-up - largish departments capable of covering undergraduate teaching without taking their members too far away from their particular areas of knowledge, areas which in all conscience will remain wide enough even under a two-field system.

*Guelph is about to change its requirements to three fields of equal value; Waterloo has just removed one minor field.

(ii) We question the virtue of fields explicitly called minor. The term is employed because in the time available no one can cover three or more fields thoroughly, but we think it unfortunate that PhD students (people entering upon the serious work of scholarship) should be expressly exposed to the notion that they are to pick up some things partially and without due depth. Minor fields help to preserve wrong mental attitudes, and in practice, by their own account, most students (not all) skimp the work for them. If the field type of training is to have the virtues claimed for it, it should rest on the assumption that everything done under it is of equal value.

(iii) We also question the usefulness of compulsory study outside history - that fashionable notion of interdisciplinary training which rarely works. The student who, on the grounds that it will assist his intended research, desires to equip himself in sociology or economics should naturally be allowed to do so, though here the field type of study seems for once less useful than special technical courses. Otherwise extraneous fields become soft options which can even be effectively ignored. We hold in general that the preliminary stage of the course should be firmly geared to the student's research interests and should be designed in the main to enable him to pursue these.

(iv) We think that positive steps should be taken to make sure that the student comes to his examination within a firmly defined period, i.e. within at most twelve months from starting work. The faculty needs to be tougher with dilatory students, but also more fully aware of and helpful to any that are wasting time because they have lost their way.

Thus we would favour two (and most certainly never more than three) fields treated as equipollent and so designed that they can be properly covered within one year.

92. The question of the examination upon these fields can be treated separately from the study of fields itself. We must remember that we are dealing with students who have been admitted as fit to work for the doctoral degree and who are subjected to intensive private study under guidance and control, often with seminars and colloquia attached. Why is it necessary to put them through formal examinations, either oral or (worse) written? (We have heard some strange stories about these conventional written examinations.) There can be only two reasons for doing so. Either one wishes to discover whether they have absorbed sufficient knowledge and understanding from their reading. But this can be established in part by relying on supervisors' reports, and in better part at the oral examination upon the dissertation, especially if the fields chosen have been deliberately made relevant to the research done. Or, alternatively, one wants to interpose yet another hurdle before allowing the student to come to his or her research - another sorting

screen. With students who have passed through the intensive examination system in use and the careful admissions procedures of the departments, this seems to us a purpose which is either unnecessary or unworthy. It is possible to make continuation in the course depend on satisfactory reports from supervisors and advisers, failing which the student should, exceptionally, be asked to undergo a set test; there can also be appeals procedures to take care of suspicions of partiality. (All this works well enough in England.) The present-style comprehensive examination is a nightmare especially to the better students, those, that is, best able and most justly desirous to immerse themselves in their research. By all accounts, it has acquired the least praiseworthy characteristics of a tribal initiation ceremony, especially the features of an unpleasant ordeal which those who have had to undergo it feel inclined to inflict upon their successors. Nothing that we have heard encourages us to see any virtue in the examination, and we should like to see it replaced on most occasions by tests more appropriate to the fact that by this stage students and teachers are supposed to be cooperating in a joint enterprise of discovery and comprehension. Reliance on the judgment of teachers, backed if necessary by the very occasional formal test, is (as indicated) one way. Another is the interesting experiment started at Waterloo, called there a colloquium. There the student can opt to be tested by means of a learned paper which he delivers in public and defends against questioners. This is a severe test, but one (it should be noticed) which entirely leaves aside at least three of the student's four fields and effectively contradicts the arguments conventionally put forward in favour of multiple fields and comprehensive examinations. It is too early to say how this idea will work out; we wish it well.

93. It will be clear by now that in our view the student should essentially be passed or failed on his dissertation - the core of every responsible PhD program, the student's own work by which he must stand or fall. It must obviously be a substantial piece, very much the candidate's personal achievement, offering fully satisfactory evidence of competent craftsmanship in research and presentation. In the Ontario history departments these (so far as we have been able to discover) are indeed the standards applied. The dissertations looked for are serious and major efforts, entirely comparable with the [illegible]ions upon which alone an English PhD student is judged for his degree. We believe that this is the right way to go about things, but it involves recognizing that all other elements in the course must be reduced in importance if the burden of inordinate length of time is to be removed. The worst possible situation would be one in which the formal, and superficially more assessable, stage was given greater prominence than the dissertation, a situation which prevails already in some universities in the USA and of which there are disturbing hints in the province. We confess to being shocked when we heard some student, and also some faculty members, take the line that a person who gets as

far as submitting a dissertation has a rightful expectation to see it accepted. This is another bad consequence of the comprehensive examination: those who pass it can come to think that they have already earned a title to the degree. The virtue, especially in international terms, of the Ontario PhD in history depends on the continued high quality of research dissertations, not on the ability to teach minor fields; and this means that the dissertation must loom largest in the whole compass of the course. It must not be allowed to dwindle, on the grounds that the whole time taken needs to be reduced and earlier stages are regarded highly. And the final examination must be rigorous and real, with the possibility still very much in mind that the dissertation can be referred back for revised submission or can even be rejected altogether.

94. Giving such importance to the dissertation does not, however, mean allowing it to drag on endlessly. We think that students should be expected to complete it within three years, the whole course thus lasting four years, and that this can be secured by the following means:

(i) At present too many students take too long to define their subject of research. At Ottawa they are not even allowed to register it until they have passed their examinations, but even departments that ask for a topic to be presented at the start of the course do nothing much about firming things up in the first year. We suggest that students should always be required to state a reasonably defined area of research at the start, that steps should be taken to develop precise topics before the examinations, and that when these are past the student should be made at once to begin the research for his dissertation. Our proposal for only two fields to be studied in the first year is designed to assist such practice.

(ii) It will be incumbent upon the faculty to adopt a different attitude to the supervision of dissertations than mostly seems to prevail at present. By a curious miscalculation, the student, so carefully taught and guided down to the examination, is likely to be thrown very much on his own resources the moment he engages in what is the only truly different and novel enterprise demanded of him. It should be recognized that training research students requires intensive teaching during the dissertation stage, especially in the early months before the student has found his feet among his materials and again at the end when he comes to write up his work. It will be objected that the student inconveniently leaves the nest (to go to the archives or to take up employment) while he is working on his dissertation and thus cannot be properly supervised. But the reorganization here proposed would take care of that. All students are bound to spend two years at the parent university, such

residence being generally required. If the second year is already given entirely to the dissertation, all or a considerable part of that can be closely supervised. We regard it as more important that the student should receive genuine teaching at this stage than at any other.

(iii) There must be more insistence that the work is completed in the time laid down, i.e. within four years altogether. There will always be exceptions - a topic can die on a man through no fault of his own (e.g. because someone else is too late discovered to be at work on it), and not everyone can guarantee permanent good health. We do not for one moment wish to impose total rigour. But extensions of time should become very much the exception, to be truly justified by exceptional circumstances. If our advice is followed, most students will in any case complete during their time as full-time students, a development very much to be encouraged.

95. We are troubled by one other aspect of the teaching structure. Partly because of the emphasis given to the study of fields, the instruction provided even for the PhD student is still too much shadowed by the knowledge-imparting methods appropriate to earlier stages. We do not find enough seminars, especially genuine research seminars in which the problems or discoveries of individual research are discussed and pursued further in a genuinely creative interchange of students and professors. We are persuaded that the PhD student must be given every opportunity - must indeed be compelled - to spread his own wings in the company of fellow-scholars at various stages of attainment. It may be objected that seminars require sufficient numbers of people working on sufficiently adjacent subjects, and that few departments in Ontario can provide this. There is some truth in this, but, in the first place, the objection falls down for the larger departments (especially if they concentrate, as mostly they do, on a restricted range of research subjects), and in the second place much could be done by various forms of cooperation (discussed below, paras. 103-117). At any rate, we recommend that regularly meeting seminars of faculty and graduate students, designed to discuss problems of research actually going forward, be organized wherever possible.

96. To sum up: we should like to see the PhD program reformed by

(i) abolishing all formal course work, of whatever kind;

(ii) reducing the fields studied to two of equal weight;

(iii) on no account allowing more than twelve months for this study;

(iv) designing fields so as to touch upon the student's research interest;

(v) modifying, if not abolishing, the comprehensive examination;

(vi) demanding that areas of research be defined soon after the start of the course, and approving dissertation topics not later than the thirteenth month of it;

(vii) adhering to a normal total course length of four years;

(viii) increasing effective teaching at the dissertation stage;

(ix) and introducing more research seminars of the advanced kind.

(c) Areas of Research

97. The areas in which departments are prepared to supervise PhD dissertations are naturally fewer than those available to MA students. The chief reason for this is rarely artificial limitation or reluctance on the part of some faculty members to take PhD students in their subjects, but rather the problem of finding materials for original research.

98. All departments, of course, accept PhDs in Canadian history. Ottawa (as for the MA) specializes in the history not only of New France but also of French Canada after the English conquest. Waterloo, Western and York exclude the period before 1759. However, there is no doubt that Canadian history receives fully sufficient attention in all its aspects and everywhere forms the staple of dissertation work. This is as it should be.

99. Everything else comes a long way after. Guelph, Queen's (up to a point), Waterloo and Western cover English modern history (since ca. 1450), and McMaster and York admit it from ca. 1700 onwards. Only Toronto acknowledges the English or European middle ages, though Waterloo will go back a bit before the Reformation for western Europe. Western and York allow western Europe since 1700, as does Queen's, with some reluctance. Eastern Europe appears, of course, at Toronto, but otherwise only at Waterloo, and there confined to the last century. Toronto and McMaster prepare PhDs in ancient history. The USA makes less of an appearance than one might have supposed: outside Toronto, only York and Waterloo give it anything like serious attention, with Queen's adding an occasional dissertation. The third world again does none too well (even at Toronto which for once lags behind others): Africa appears at Waterloo and York, Latin America at Western and York, and Asia (east Asia only) at York alone. This last, however, is a very promising looking program. Thus there are two universities (Carleton and Ottawa) where the Canadian diet is varied hardly or not at all; McMaster has a strong line in British history which is getting unusual in the province; Queen's, capable of greater diversity, yet prefers to concentrate on Canada; the variety offered at Waterloo and York, attractive on the face of it, is not so far matched by numerical strength and the programs are too young to make judgment possible;

only Toronto, and to a much lesser degree Western, have established well varied programs in non-Canadian history. At the same time, we wish to welcome the initiatives at York and Waterloo; it may be too early to say how they will work out, but the beginnings are encouraging. We must also point out that Carleton's exclusively Canadian program is entirely new, and that people there are in no way averse to expanding in time into other fields; while Ottawa's specializing in French Canadian history deliberately exploits the department's unique standing as a body of French-speaking historians within the setting of English-speaking Ontario.

100. Altogether, we do not mean this analysis to sound critical or even possibly hostile. We appreciate the special reasons for which some departments are restricting their interests, and in general we fully accept the argument that research can be pursued only in materials and sources available. Yet in modern conditions these are not so confined as seems sometimes still to be thought. The microfilm and the activities of reprint publishers have enormously multiplied the materials for primary research which a university library can acquire, and many Ontario libraries have done their duty nobly (paras. 121-122). These activities are discussed below; here we would only remark that in modern conditions the availability of suitable teaching fauclty is more important in creating viable areas of research than is access to sources. It is in this context that our disappointment with some faculty members' unwillingness to take their field of interest through to PhD level becomes important. We should explain how we see the possibilities. It is true that no student should work on the history of a country that he has never seen, and that not even films and reprints make it unnecessary to visit foreign archives. It is, however, our view that a practice already occasionally used here and there should be applied a little more widely. Departments such as Western, McMaster and York, not to mention Toronto, command both teaching strength and library resources quite sufficient to start students seriously on research in English history (including medieval), some parts (usually France) of European history, and often the history of the USA. We should like to see more - a few more - students encouraged to work in these fields, beginning their labours at home and travelling to spend a year or so in the country of their choice, before returning to write up the research again at base. In the nature of things (especially things financial) there will not be many such cases, and some students will prefer to use money obtained to do all their work abroad, for the degree of a foreign university. It is, however, easier to get money for one year than for three, provided departments will start their people off and establish informal contacts abroad for the second stage. If Canadian historians are to enter the international community of scholars with the effect that their numbers and quality justify, they will have to emancipate themselves from the provincialism which excessive preoccupation with their own country imposes. It is also once more relevant to note that Canadian history is young, as history goes; a research scene overwhelmingly devoted to one country and 200 years of time does need diversifying in space and time.

(d) So many Schools of Research?

101. This lack of regional variation brings us to a question which has to be asked - and which we were both often offered and asked ourselves: in view of the existence of a great university at Toronto, with a major PhD program which attracts nearly half the students, and in view of the fact that expansion at York (desirable in itself) would add further to imbalance, is the proliferation of such studies justified? In particular, is there any reason for adding to them (as at Carleton)? We can only say that on several grounds we wish to see the existing graduate programs at the PhD level maintained and even, where possible, expanded.

(i) The demand for student places is holding up (para. 36). It can be satisfied only by the existing range of programs.

(ii) By no means all the excellent or even the competent graduate faculty belong to Toronto/York. Such students as should and do want to work with particular teachers must find the opportunity to do so.

(iii) Toronto covers well the more traditional ways of studying history but is not proving lavish in innovation. There is a real need for more experimental schools of history and for attention to parts of the world not well represented at Toronto.

(iv) In fact, this need exists most strongly in, of all things, Canadian history, a subject in need of some blood-transfusion. The concentration on French Canada at Ottawa, the inclination towards interdisciplinary procedures and socio-economic questions at Waterloo, York and McMaster, point in the right direction.

(v) Even in Canadian history, departments could greatly develop the study of particular regions and localities. Queen's and Western, who already do a little of this, would be well advised to do more. There are, for instance, problems touching the relations of both western and south-eastern Ontario with the southern neighbour which would prove fruitful, and there are socio-demographic topics in the regions which anywhere else would be swarmed over by research students.

(vi) Historical materials are by no means concentrated in the Toronto area. The city of Ottawa, in particular, provides the major archive centre of the province which Ottawa, Carleton (see para. 141) and Queen's are best placed to exploit; and various institutions have gathered archive resources of their own which are discussed below (paras. 129-132). It requires a spread of PhD programs to do justice to all this.

102. The PhD programs in history are generally in sound shape and indeed meritorious; they are also generally rather too leisurely and

somewhat conservative. Ontario possesses the foundations of a major school of history both domestic and international, solidly - and rightly - grounded upon traditional methods and lines of enquiry. These foundations need building upon, and we are persuaded that that activity will not only be greatly assisted by distributing it over a number of departments but will be positively hindered if variety is reduced and anything resembling a near-monopoly is created in one institution or even one regional centre.

(E) Cooperation

(a) Informal

103. We have suggested (paras. 6-7) that history can occupy a mediating position among the disciplines. How far do the departments in the Ontario universities aspire to this function or fulfil it? They are, no doubt, called in on occasion to assist other departments in their own university, as members of graduate students' committees or otherwise, but we do not know how frequently this may occur. Their own active relations with these other departments are very variable. Historians who, by the accident of the structure, find themselves belonging to departments of economics or political science or sociology are quite commonly asked to sit on advisory or examining committees, but we found (if memory serves) only one single instance of such an "outsider" serving as supervisor of a dissertation in a history department. Generally speaking, contacts are purely personal and far from intensive. We were most impressed by the contribution made by other departments at Guelph where the relationship is not only full of relaxed zest but also directly profitable inasmuch as it greatly amplifies the offerings of the history department. McMaster obtains assistance from the Classics Department with its degrees in ancient history, as does Toronto which also actively engages in fruitful exchanges with the Centre for Medieval Studies, the historians of science, and Islamic historians. The lack of real contact that most deplore is between historians in history departments and econo historians in economics departments: failure of collaboration here produces genuinely adverse effects upon scholarship, especially in Canadian history. Mostly because the economic historians tend to operate on a foundation of economic theory which they demand also from history students, contacts are generally tenuous; we noted this at McMaster, Queen's and Western, leading centres of graduate work, while at Toronto the horizontal floor which separates the two departments has assumed the characteristic of a national boundary. In general, we regard the departmental structure of the universities as an obstacle to proper scholarly relations, and we sympathize with the dean of the Faculty of Arts at McMaster who would like to inject more reality into his Faculty by reducing the impermeable membranes between departments. This is a problem outside our immediate brief, but we must note that the structure prevailing everywhere, however convenient administratively and in the teaching of undergraduates, is not designed to make the best

use of resources at an advanced level - quite apart from denying to scholars on the faculty the full benefit of coexistence with practitioners of other disciplines. We would recommend that the Council of Ontario Universities might consider the departmental set-up and the possibility of rendering it more flexible. Perhaps the historians of Ontario might demonstrate their central position in the affairs of living academies by taking a lead here.

104. Informal relationships between history departments in different universities were not more encouraging. There are, of course, exceptions. Queen's enjoys the services of a professor from Trent as supervisor of a PhD student. The departments at Ottawa and Carleton not only tend to foregather in the same places of entertainment but also cooperated in producing the periodical Histoire Sociale/Social History.* Toronto professors help with York's Chinese history program. Waterloo (which has learned good habits from its reliance on the faculty at affiliated Colleges) cooperates frequently with Wilfrid Laurier. But we found, somewhat to our astonishment, that a good many people had very little idea of what was going on elsewhere; and the constant refrain at York, emphasizing the alleged problems involved in a fifteen mile journey to Toronto (in a car-based society) struck us as strange. It must be said that Toronto recently showed little interest in York, with the exception of one inter-university program mentioned below (para. 115); we understand that improvements are in hand.

105. Historians, like all university teachers, are very busy men and have plenty to do to keep up with the work of their own department. The relative isolation of one department from another is not a matter for blame so much as for regret. We hope that it will weaken as people come to recognize the benefits to be gained from cooperation. In any case, manifestations of more institutionalized joint work are probably more significant, but it appears to us that both what has already been achieved in that direction and future developments depend in the first instance on informal contacts of which we should like to see more. We turn to formal developments.

(b) Intra-University Arrangements

106. At several universities, centres or groups have been set up sometimes with staff of their own but more commonly in reliance on members of existing departments, in which historians are actively engaged. We review the more significant ones.

*Other journals aided by history departments: Canadian Historical Review (Toronto); Ontario History; Historical Reflections: Reflections Historics; The Memonite Quarterly Review (Waterloo).

107. Carleton: the Institute of Canadian Studies (offering the MA degree) helps to bring together historians, economists, geographers, social scientists, etc.

108. Guelph: an interdisciplinary Committee on Scottish Studies links history, English, philosophy and sociology. Graduate students in appropriate subjects can get help here, but in the first place this is a discussion group of seniors.

109. McMaster: here a flourishing Eighteenth Century Society has been formed which organizes meetings and symposia embracing a wide range of disciplines and bringing in people from outside. The results of meetings are published in substantial volumes, and there is talk of starting a journal. The society has no formal share in the teaching of the department or in graduate programs, but graduate students are members and quite manifestly benefit. This is an excellent institution, worthy of imitation - just the sort of imaginative initiative of which we should like to see more.

110. Ottawa: there are two essentially research-based centres here, one for French Canadian Civilization and one for Religious History. We are not much impressed by the second which seems loosely organized and somewhat inactive; it appeared to contribute little to the graduate program. By contrast, the first is vigorous and highly encouraging. It possesses the makings of a good seminar library and goes out of its way to bring in graduate students and to assist them; though not primarily intended as part of the teaching structure, it very manifestly shares in the work of instruction. Its new head is an historian of energy and sense. We believe that this centre will play an increasing part in the promotion of historical studies.

111. Toronto: here there are quite a few organizations of real significance to historians. The Institute of History and Philosophy of Science and Technology not only has six historians in it, but its head is an historian and maintains the closest contact with the department. Graduate students from the latter take courses there (though the Institute would like to see more of them coming in). The Institute struck us as go-ahead and well balanced (and very ill-housed). Experts in central and east European studies have formed themselves into a group which meets four times a year; though they call themselves a centre, they have no physical location, but they provide a very useful focus for an area of history which is weak in the Ontario universities. The same is true of a so-called Centre for Renaissance Studies, also more of a regular discussion society than a teaching or research institute. The Centre for Medieval Studies, on the other hand, approximates far more to this last definition, being a selfconscious and powerful little group of experts who are cross-appointed to departments but have evolved an interdisciplinary identity of their own. They are a feature of distinction on the Ontario academic scene - its

outstanding link with the continuity of European civilization. Graduate students have the full benefit of their attention. A Centre for Islamic Studies is being planned, mainly based (naturally) on the department of that name; we hope that when it comes into being historians concerned with Mediterranean, African and Asian history will play an active part in it.

112. Western: there is talk here of setting up an Asian Studies program with, presumably, an interdisciplinary PhD. A good idea, but comment must await the sight of the finished article.

113. It will be seen that arrangements of this kind are highly variable and flexible. All have their uses in bringing people together and developing interests held in common but too often pursued separately. The main criticism must be that there are not enough such schemes. We applaud them all and hope to see more of them come into being. However, from the point of view of graduate programs they all play a minor part, very useful where it occurs but nowhere controlling or directing. This is essentially as it should be: our liking for cross-disciplinary and cross-departmental arrangements arises not from any desire to see departments deprived of the sovereign running of graduate studies, but only from a conviction that interchanges of this kind will improve the department's conduct of their own operations. Above all, such schemes can and do break down the isolation of graduate students.

(c) Inter-University Arrangements

114. Formal cooperative schemes between universities are rare indeed. We are aware of only two, both commendable.

115. Toronto and York have joined in a Victorian Studies Program leading to the MA. Faculty from both universities and several disciplines teach courses, and students from either participate. Although there is some feeling that Toronto provides more faculty and York more students, with a consequent desire in Toronto to see the balance redressed, the program seems to work sufficiently well to suggest that it should expand into a joint enterprise for the PhD degree, too.

116. Guelph and Waterloo have set up a joint Consortium in Reformation History (offering the MA, MPhil, and PhD degrees), easily the most ambitious and enterprising project at present conceived in all the history departments we visited. It rests upon established pillars in both universities - the powerful interest in Scottish Reformation and Calvinist history at Guelph, the strong concern with Mennonite and Anglican history at Waterloo, while Wilfrid Laurier (not fully involved because it does not award the PhD) contributes scholars and library

resources to add a Lutheran dimension. The existence at Waterloo of Conrad Grebel College, possessed of a fine collection for the history of protestant sects as well as ready access to the anabaptist material at Goshen College (Indiana), has enabled the program to rest upon a broad base and quite unique concerns. It could well become a world centre for studies in the so-called Radical Reformation, especially if the College gets its hands (as it looks like doing) on the best existing collection of Russian sectarian history. (It may be added that the Roman Catholic resources of St. Jerome's College, likely to be augmented by the institutional library of the Resurrectionist Order at present in Rome, could usefully be added to remind Reformation scholars of the fact of the Counter-Reformation.) The Consortium was set up by the two history departments who continue to run it, but they receive assistance from other historians, linguists, sociologists, and even a musicologist. The scheme is designed to exploit a unique and essentially accidental constellation of scholars and resources which happen to be within easy driving distance of one another. This is the first year of its operation, and we cannot therefore yet judge how well the excellent intentions will be carried out; but no one can help but be impressed by the enthusiasm of the founders or the good sense that has gone into the planning. The Consortium deserves every interested person's good wishes, and the signs are favourable indeed, though it will before long have to survive the retirement, for reasons of age, of one of its founding fathers.

117. We cannot escape the conclusion that more enterprises of this kind, linking scholars working in different institutions but physically not all that far apart, are urgently called for. In this way, limited resources can be strikingly magnified, and some people (both faculty and students), at present left isolated within departments whose predominant interests in Canadian history they may not share, can find reassurance that others of their kind exist. We shall later offer some suggestions for further developments along these lines (para. 161).

(F) Libraries and Archives

118. The lives of working historians revolve around libraries and their research depends on the existence of archives. Though all scholars claim to be devoted to books, none are more addicted to them than historians. Unlike scientists, natural or social, they find that few books ever entirely cease to be of value (provided that they had value in the first place); one cannot "supersede" works of history, nor can one really abstract that which needs to be learned into "textbooks". Historical textbooks are, by and large, so bad because the whole notion is contrary to the manner in which historical knowledge needs to be acquired, stored and disseminated. As for archives, these are bound to be unique, and even the coming of the microform record has only alleviated the problem of using them - the problem which still leaves

the historian as a travelling scholar. Libraries do possess the theoretical ability, greater than ever with modern methods of reproduction, of providing everything wanted in one place. The state of university libraries is both exceptionally vital to the work of history departments and an excellent indicator of the health of those departments. The point needs labouring the less because we found it fully understood not only among historians but also among librarians in the province. Wherever we went, we heard that the history department was noticeably more active in making demands on libraries and noticeably more eager to cooperate with them than other departments. The librarian at McMaster feels that during many years of this work in many places "I have never come across a department so cooperative or so demanding as this Department of History"; the implications of this slightly awed comment hold good throughout the province.

(a) Libraries

119. We have been supplied with massive and detailed information from university libraries, which is on record; here it will suffice to extract the main items of precise information (Table XX) and to comment on them. The figures provided are not entirely comparable as accounting procedures differ from university to university. We also learned a great deal especially about the daily working of libraries and the atmosphere prevailing from even brief visits on the spot. Departments and libraries generally agree that the resources of every institution are fully sufficient for all the programs present in operation. With this we agree, but with three somewhat divergent reservations.

(i) In the smaller institutions, the existing holdings determine not only the regions in which really advanced work is possible but also the periods and aspects which can be studied. This is particularly true of work outside Canadian history; e.g. at Guelph and McMaster, work in British history is well provided for if it deals with politics, political thought or religion, but less satisfactorily if the student's interest lies in socio-economic directions.

(ii) The contentment with existing conditions will rapidly evaporate unless continuous and ever more expensive efforts are made to keep up with the flood of new publications. All involved are well aware of this - or, we should perhaps say, all except those who in the last resort control the supply of money.

(iii) Many institutions possess research materials that at present are condemned to idleness by the unwillingness of departments to expand the interests served by PhD programs. Here British history is the chief sufferer because the decline of an earlier concern with it has left behind valuable materials stranded on a shoal of indifference. We do not mean to direct students into particular forms of research, but we think such interests exist and could be encouraged; and we regret the willingness of specialists to withdraw from the fray when they often have such magnificent materials

at their disposal.

120. In assessing library resources, two points must be kept in mind. The need to obtain some collectable figures has led to the drawing up of a library profile which inevitably omits some important areas. History unfortunately penetrates into all sorts of corners in every library, and from the historian's point of view the Library of Congress classification is probably the most idiotic ever invented. The figures obtained therefore tend to hide the existence of directly relevant material among categories supposedly reserved for economists, lawyers, and so forth. Secondly, nearly every department has additional recourse to the libraries of affiliated or adjacent institutions, such as the colleges at Toronto, Western and Waterloo, or the public libraries of Ottawa and Toronto. Windsor even utilizes the public facilities of Detroit. In many cases these side-libraries concentrate on providing for the needs of undergraduates and do not greatly affect what is available for advanced, especially for PhD. work, but in other cases they contribute weightily. Huron College at London considerably augments the range of serious monographs in British history available to historians at Western; Conrad Grebel College at Waterloo is essential to the Reformation program there. Still, all this allowed for, it remains the case that the basic figures supplied give a reasonable indication of the state of affairs and can be used as crude indicators.

121. The Robarts Library of the University of Toronto is obviously outstanding - unique in the province and among the top few university libraries on the North American continent. It is a great library serving the needs of all scholars at every level, and no more needs here to be said about it. Its stature, however, has consequences for historians elsewhere in the province to which we revert below (para. 142).

122. The other three libraries with exceptionally large holdings in history are at McMaster, Western and York, the latter two adding a really enromous collection of material in microform which the first seems rather to have eschewed. No one really likes reading microfilm or microcard, though systems are improving; but libraries like those of Western and York, by accepting the necessity, have added greatly to their collection of primary research material. Government publications, especially for Canada, are generally well supplied (no library is without good holdings and nearly all are excellent), an important point for people researching in recent Canadian history but also in the history of modern Britain and the Commonwealth. York's library possesses an exceptional asset for French Canadian studies in the collection acquired from the Ducharme bookstore in Montreal whose 125,000 items (not by any means all historical, of course) are additional to its large history section. Inevitably, the other recent foundations have not built up holdings so large as exist at older places or at York, where money seems to have been spent with singular efficiency, though - considering the circumstances - they have done well. They manage to cover current publications satisfactorily but have great difficulty in constructing the foundation of older books which are often important in an historical library. The inter-library loan scheme

in consequence plays an important part in supporting research and PhD programs; we heard much favourable comment. In the immediate future, the big problem is the increase in the cost of books, especially of those invaluable multi-volume publications of sources (records or letters) which it will be beyond the budget of most institutions to acquire in quantity. We are happy to be able to report that ways and means are being developed to solve these difficulties by cooperation. A unionized catalogue is in preparation, initiated (we understand) by the librarians of McMaster and Guelph, which will ultimately embrace all university libraries except probably that of Toronto; it will not only greatly ease the task of finding rare volumes already in stock but also make possible a cooperative buying policy, distributing the burden of expensive and important, though not very often used, publications between the member institutions. We may add that we found librarians competently determined in the face of these undoubted problems, and we encountered remarkably little despondency.

123. In many ways, a library's holdings of serial publications offers the best and quickest guide to its usefulness to historians. The check-list prepared (rather haphazardly) for this enquiry included 175 items, some of them pretty peculiar; it has evoked some critical derision, but it also contains the obviously important journals that should be there. We regard a return of 65% held as indicating a satisfactory state of affairs. By this standard, Carleton, McMaster, Ottawa, Queen's, Toronto, Western, Windsor (less expectedly), and York do very well (Table XX, col. 4); Waterloo just reaches the dividing line and Guelph just falls below it; the only inadequate libraries are those of the small institutions with very limited graduate programs. However, what looks at first sight a very fair picture hides a serious deficiency, highlighted in col. 5 of Table XX. This shows how complete are the runs of the periodicals allegedly stored in the library. Anything less than 100% means some broken runs or late starts, and a broken run detracts very seriously from the value of possessing the periodical at all. We regard any percentage below about 80 as very unsatisfactory: libraries should make every effort to acquire complete runs of their journals, especially as for most of them backnumbers or reprints are available. By our standard, only Ottawa, Queen's, Toronto, Western and Windsor come up to scratch, while Guelph and Lakehead approach the required level. Carleton, Waterloo and McMaster do poorly, possessing on average only just half the total issues of their periodicals. So does York whose low average is seemingly produced by the presence (perhaps through gifts) of a large number of odd volumes of many journals. This problem calls for and deserves a special solution. The inadequate libraries are not to blame for their state: it is a question of money, and the more active a library has been in subscribing to serials the larger the difficulty of achieving 100% runs everywhere is bound to be. We therefore propose that a special grant be set aside for libraries, earmarked for the sole purpose of completing such runs of periodicals as are in print. Gaps of single volumes occur: these can be filled with xerox copies. It should be realized that unless this money is made

available, that already spent on serial publications is in part wasted. We should like to see this matter treated as one of urgent priority.

124. Table XX also shows that energetic efforts have lately been made to bring libraries up to the standard required by scholars. The most striking improvement is at McMaster which ten years ago spent $2,000 p.a. on history but allocated $63,000 in 1972/73. The averaged annual figures in col. 6 hide some quite interesting fluctuations but are the best indicator of the long-term effort. It will be seen that the older libraries (Toronto and Queen's) have in fact spent [illegible]st in keeping up the quality of the collection, and we think that the figures for Western would show the same thing if they were available. But the money spent by the newly set up operations at Guelph, Carleton, McMaster, Waterloo, Windsor and York is also satisfactory. Set against the demands raised by laboratory-based disciplines, most of these sums are puny; by the standards applied (unhappily) in money-supplying circles, they are good. What is less good is a comparison between columns 6 and 7. Only McMaster, Toronto and Wilfrid Laurier propose to spend more in 1973/74 than their annual average for 1968/73; there are drastic drops at Lakehead (which, having to build from scratch, may perhaps now have found its more normal annual level), Guelph, Windsor and York. The drop is smaller but still serious at Queen's; at Waterloo they would seem to be roughly holding the line. Of course, newly founded universities did have to spend more at the start, in order to create any sort of library at all, but the general conclusions stand. In view of the fact that in future the same sum of money is going to buy about one third less in volumes, these facts describe a major decline in the buying activities of libraries on behalf of history - at a time when the production of important learned works, the output of source-collections, and the introduction of valuable new journals call for an ever greater financial effort. We draw attention to this crisis in full awareness of the difficulties. Nevertheless, universities will have to increase their library budgets considerably if they are not to lose the scholarly standing attained.

125. We found a proper and agreeable pride regarding their territory in all librarians and their staffs. Enthusiasm, good will, and sound professional standards were everywhere apparent. Among a quantity of impressive institutions, often working under difficulties, we would draw special attention to the remarkable pioneering activities of the library at Guelph - successfully designed to exploit modern technology in the interests of the user rather than the guardian. The methods there introduced, especially the role of computerization in cataloguing and circulation, and the flexibility produced by using virtually no fixed furniture, are worthy of serious study and imitation everywhere, not only in the province.

126. Cooperation between libraries and history departments is invariably excellent. Librarians regard historians as the most active and demanding, but also as the most cooperative and knowledgeable, of their clients; and historians very properly spare neither time nor labour in assisting

in the creation of the sort of collection they need. Most departments detail one of their members for special liaison with the library, and both parties to the arrangement express satisfaction at the outcome. A lot depends on the skill and devotion of the individual chosen, but a lot also on the cooperation he gets from his colleagues; we heard nothing but praise, and we concur. In turn, libraries are careful to assign specialists to look after history departments, and these members of staff universally earn the highest commendation - which is, perhaps, the less surprising because quite a few departments have infiltrated their own advanced graduates into these key positions. The most imaginative and successful arrangements are made at Waterloo where the library has designated two of its staff as specialists in history, while the department has taken care to add these librarians fully to its own company. Other places could usefully follow this practice which wipes out otherwise inevitable differences of approach and prevents personality clashes; an excellent situation could thus be further improved.

127. The one deficiency which we noticed must, however, be mentioned in this otherwise somewhat cloying chorus of praise. Most libraries are weak in their holdings of books and periodicals in any language except English. They naturally respond here to the distressing fact that few students either could or would read any other language, but virtual restriction to English works creates serious gaps in several areas of history. Of course, the deficiency is not total, but buying policy (dictated by limited resources and the need to buy first what will be widely used) is going to increase it.

(b) Archives

128. One of the more interesting activities of several universities has been the collection of archive material for historical studies This helps to create real centres of research additional to those most obvious - Ottawa and Toronto, housing respectively the national and provincial government archives - which naturally form the major locations for all research in Canadian history. Though Carleton and Ottawa on the one hand, Toronto and York on the other, obviously benefit most immediately and easily, all specialists in the province and research students in Canadian history are likely at some time or other to end up in these archives. In general, the people concerned seem satisfied both with the running of the archives themselves and with the financial support available to those who want to travel there from a distance. We hear that the National Archives are to move to new quarters, which seems a pity; their present home has a delicious air of leisured charm, very different, for instance, from the Grand Central Station atmosphere of the Public Record Office in London with its huge collections and strictly professional attitudes.

129. An important archive centre has been created at Queen's without much attempt to give it a specialized or regional character. The library has acquired the papers of quite a number of leading political figures, including those of Lord Tweedsmuir (John Buchan), as well as of important businessmen and journalists. In addition there is the Lorne Pierce collection of Canadian poets and writers which has great value also for historical studies. In effect, the university now constitutes an independent research centre for Canadian political and intellectual history which is crying out for ever more energetic exploitation.

130. By contrast, Western has concentrated on creating a centre of research into the western Ontario region, by assembling massive local materials touching business, industry, population studies, and politics. The recent acquisition of the Minute Books (1850-1969) of the London and Port Stanley Railroad deserves special mention. Here again there is a place offering many happy, dusty and laborious days to relays of researchers. Further west still, Lakehead is building up a subsidiary centre for local studies.

131. McMaster, too, has gone into the business of archive-acquisition, though here one cannot speak of any general principle underlying the collection. Pride of place belongs to the papers of Bertrand Russell (personal materials and the records of his Peace Foundation) which are keeping the university in very close touch with a range of scholars (and of cranks) everywhere. The prospective addition of the papers of another pair of English eccentrics - Vera Britain and her husband George Catlin - will make the Russell collection feel less lonely in an archive which mingles a major collection of Canadian Baptist materials with the records of the Canadian Union of Students, and adds the papers of G. J. Holyoake and John Connell.

132. Waterloo (or rather Conrad Grebel College) is well on the way towards becoming a major centre for primary research in the history of Protestant sects, especially the Mennonites (para. 116).

133. All these archives are well managed, readily and generously accessible, and staffed by enthusiasts. They will gradually attract more and more scholars also from outside Canada. Thus they form one of the more promising phenomena in any conspectus of historical studies in the province.

(c) Summary

134. Advanced work in history in Ontario receives generally adequate and occasionally exceptional support from the resources of libraries and archives. Existing MA and PhD programs are well maintained, and

resources exist in several places to support carefully controlled expansions in those programs (Queen's, Western, York). Only Toronto offers absolutely first-class conditions to the scholar, but services are not unimpressive anywhere. Fundamental research benefits both from the labours of librarians and the growing availability of valuable archive material. Librarians and archivists like their historians, and the feelings are mutual. The picture fully supports our general conclusions about the state of history in the province. However, the future looks markedly less bright, unless fairly formidable efforts are made at the provincial level to increase the money available for maintaining the impetus gained; and some of the highly desirable progress and expansion, for which we call elsewhere in this report, unquestionably requires higher library budgets. In particular, however, we would emphasize that even to stand only still libraries will need to spend at least a quarter more money than it is intended they shall disburse upon books and serials in history in 1973/74.

III. IMMEDIATE DEVELOPMENTS

135. It should be said, in the first place, that history departments everywhere are very conscious of the present. The air that hangs about them is rarely one of gloom, but everywhere we encountered what may perhaps be called realistic resignation. Hardly anyone plans developments, because everyone knows that there will be no fresh money. On balance, this attitude is perhaps more reassuring than a careless and sanguine optimism would be, but it has its dubious side, especially in alliance with the manifest conservatism in most respects touching the work which we found so pervasive. Senior faculty, in particular, do not criticize such things as course-structure, main scholarly interests, or methods of teaching and research; and while the younger faculty often display an encouraging concern to branch out into new areas of history and new ways of thinking about it, they also as a rule are satisfied with the shape and formalities of the system. Stare super vias antiquas is no doubt a good principle for historians, but unless it is linked to some active petitio rerum novarum it leads quickly to stagnation. We have already indicated that we cannot entirely agree with this degree of conservatism, but the point that disquiets us most remains to be discussed.

136. With the exception of Laurentian's new MA program, the new PhD at Carleton, and Waterloo's very recent introduction of the PhD, no department plans to increase intake. The word "plateau" became very familiar in our discussions, and no one seemed to recollect that there are few drearier natural features than that. With one exception, all departments agreed that they would in no way want to adjust admissions to the academic posts likely to be available for their charges; they held, wisely, that grown-up men and women, made properly aware of what the prospects are, must be left to choose for themselves whether nevertheless they want to undertake graduate work. With this we entirely agree, as did virtually every student whom we confronted with the question. We do not, however, understand why this sensible attitude should be linked so firmly with a determination to regard the numbers now in the program as somehow fixed by God and nature. A modest expansion is all that anyone would suggest, and indeed all that either student demand or teaching resources justify; all we would plead for is less of the "plateau" mentality and a general readiness to envisage a small growth. Greater diversification will depend on it.

137. The exception is more serious. It is the department at York where alone we were told that they felt a responsibility towards their students which prohibited them from increasing the graduate program beyond the present very small number of PhDs. Paternalism here combined disconcertingly with a proclaimed concern for undergraduate teaching which, laudable in itself, appears to some to have become

the passionate article of faith which an unthinkingly extreme reaction against earlier attitudes has recently evolved in the USA. We should exempt the program in Chinese studies from these strictures: here a scholarly dynamism is at work. We should also note that there is a contrary attitude held by some very promising scholars, at present in a minority. The main part of the faculty, whether engaged in graduate work or not, felt that the calls of the undergraduate program, work for other departments (at the same level), and the national job situation inhibited any expansion, however small. Yet this is the second largest department in the province, possessed of some outstanding scholars and teachers. We have said several times that we do not decry undergraduate teaching, but we deprecate a single-minded devotion to it as much as we would disapprove of a single-minded neglect of it. We believe that the History Department at York has a duty to shoulder a larger share of graduate work - a duty to its own members (some of the younger among whom talk as though they were teaching at a community college), a duty to the university, a duty to graduate studies in the province, and a duty to scholarship. We also believe that in this they would find support from the administration of the university. Again, we state no particular requirement: it is a change of heart that we look for.

138. Guelph has a special problem in that the size of its PhD program is fixed, by provincial edict, at 15 persons at any given time. This unique provision resulted, it seems, from mistaken rigidity on the part of the original appraisers, or perhaps from some administrative misunderstanding. It seems pointless and hampering; excellent students have had to be turned away because of it and because they applied in the wrong year. The department does not actually want to expand much or at all, but it wants to be able to accept the additional student now and again, while occasionally allowing the total to drop below the magic figure. We agree. The limitation should be repealed forthwith, on the understanding that no serious expansion will result; and if now and again there are in consequence some 18 or 19 students in the program (which itself is better than some) we see no harm in that.

139. There are two MA programs, one a few years old and one new this year, at Lakehead and Laurentian, the latter of which needs approval for funding. We are happy to offer it. We have already explained why we think these developments highly desirable (paras. 11, 64); we have good confidence in the cautiously devised and carefully planned programs in operation; and we recommend that they be funded. We would, however, add some remarks about the situation at Laurentian. Like Ottawa, that university regards itself as a link between the French and English communities in Canada, and it could indeed serve a most useful function there. At present, however, its history department is not well equipped to discharge it. Only two of its active members are French-speaking, and while at present French-speaking students

are too few to seem to justify adding more professors, the situation has to be planned for the future. New francophone schools in the region will produce students who will find the present set-up so unsatisfactory that they will either have to go to Ottawa or fail to get all the education of which they are capable. We look for at least two more French-speaking appointments, preferably one in British and Imperial history and one in Canadian history. If the province is serious (as it ought to be) about bilingualism and really wants to fulfil the purpose of establishing a university at Sudbury, it must recognize the consequences of its just policy and pay the expenses of improving contacts between the communities.

140. Two PhD programs remain unfunded. That at Waterloo, which has been running for four years, is already well established. In some ways it struck us as the most remarkable program of all. It naturally lacks the solidity of such established schools as Toronto, Queen's and Western, but for that very reason perhaps it seems more full of life than any of those three. It has already shown itself capable of participating in the most remarkable new enterprise found among history departments (para. 116). Its faculty includes some unusually innovative senior men and as good a bunch of junior scholars as we encountered anywhere; and its students were assuredly the equal of anything we saw. The fact that the program remains unfunded strikes us as surprising, if not scandalous, and we recommend that the deficiency be remedied at once.

141. Carleton this year admitted its first PhD students, and we interviewed all three of them. We had no difficulty in recognizing in them three different and familiar types of the good student - almost as though the department had tried to create a three-dimensional atmosphere from the first! The faculty are more than capable of carrying out what they have undertaken. Indeed, our only criticism would touch upon the undue delay in bringing the program into being and the reluctance to start on a bigger scale, offering more areas of study. The teaching faculty includes several excellent scholars, able and willing to direct advanced research, and in particular able to contribute novel and special approaches in socio-economic history, not found elsewhere in the province, to the study of Canadian history. The proximity of the National Archives provides a strong attraction for good students interested in these innovations. Lastly, it should be noted that Carleton can and should provide an English-speaking balance to the predominantly francophone orientation of Ottawa. Once both institutions offer the PhD, the opportunity exists for immensely fruitful cooperative and complementary enterprises. Thus, we regard Carleton's initiative as entirely justified and we recommend that this program should be funded forthwith.

142. One aspect of the library situation requires special comment. Though the Robarts Library is now the library of the University of

Toronto, it was at one time planned to serve library interests for the whole province. It is also, beyond question, the greatest library in Ontario and indeed one of the great university libraries of the world. Except that it happens to be attached to a university, it is the nearest thing Canada possesses to the British Museum in Britain, the Bibliotheque Nationale in France, or the Library of Congress in the United States. Yet not unnaturally it behaves like a university library, opening its doors freely to members of the parent institution and very grudgingly to scholars from other universities. There is much complaint of this around the province which we regard as justified. We maintain that all Ontario faculty members and bona fide research students should have equal access with members of the University of Toronto. They should be admitted without special certification on every single occasion (as at present), being given a permanent reader's ticket upon identifying themselves as persons qualified in the terms just stated. It may, on the other hand, be thought proper to deny borrowing rights to persons not resident in Toronto; books should not be so freely removed from the city, and the inter-library loan scheme exists to take care of the problem. We think it unlikely that this change would swamp the library with readers, but in any case serving all this class of readers appears to us to be the proper function of that great library. We collected a hint that moves in the right direction have begun, though they do not seem to be known yet outside library circles; we urge that the situation be rapidly reformed.*

*Since this report was drafted the necessary steps have been initiated.

IV. THE FUTURE

(a) Manpower Planning

143. The discussion of things to come must begin with the future of students admitted to graduate programs in history. In recent years, the concept of human resources and their contribution to economic growth has come to be accepted in some economic thinking. One of the problems which follows from this approach is the effective allocation of occupational skills within a population, i.e. manpower planning, an issue which has troubled universities in every part of the world over the last decade or so.

144. In this case, effective manpower planning must include the whole of Canada. To plan only for a province or a region, in a free society such as this, would be futile. Indeed, given the international mobility of professional persons, it can be argued very cogently that even national planning is ineffective. At any rate, the interests of national integration strongly encourage the free movement of people within the country, even though at one time a province may be a "donor" and at another a "recipient" of skilled and professional labour. The alternative - concentrating on localized provincial interests - must be inherently undesirable for the country as a whole.

145. The problem of predicting manpower needs so that students may be directed effectively into occupations and employment are extremely complex, and so far at least the exercise resembles divination rather than science. Fluctuations in the demand for skills occur with great rapidity, in response to economic, political and technological changes, and it is in conditions so changeable that students who are still four years or more from entering the labour market have to be advised (or make up their own minds). Thus the margin for error is very large, even if it is assumed that the initial advice is based on reliable information. This difficulty arose very clearly in the sixties with respect to the sciences, as did the problem of over-reaction to apparent shortages of certain types of skilled personnel. Thus the time-lag factor must somehow be overcome before this form of planning can be an effective part of university guidance; and we see no sign that anyone has yet succeeded so far in refining prophecy.

146. There remains the question of free choice. When a student chooses to pursue a particular course of study, a university has an obligation to advise him (and her) of the possible career implications - to the extent that these can be foreseen. However, the student need not take that advice. As universities have been, and are today, far more than vocational schools, the right to pursue seemingly esoteric courses of study must continue to exist.

147. It is true that student interest in courses of study may be influenced to some extent through the allocation of money for student loans, bursaries and other forms of scholarship assistance. This approach has always suffered from two constraints. First, it has generally been associated with some form of repayment when students do not, for whatever reason, complete the course of study for which assistance is given. Such schemes, whether through bonding or other techniques, do not appear to be effective. Second, this whole approach is better suited to the circumstances of a closed and selective university than to the contemporary Canadian university with its growing quality of openness.

148. We recognize that the problem of manpower planning is a serious one. At the moment, however, no way in which it can be met is known, other than by the free play of open market conditions of supply and demand, plus effective student guidance to the extent that this is possible. We think that these conditions are sufficiently met in the departments investigated.

149. To illustrate the difficulties inherent in projecting, with any degree of accuracy, the precise need for highly educated specialists, one need only cite a recent report from Statistics Canada (Advance Statistics of Education 1973-74). For Canada, the report gives the number of university students as 322,300 for 1972/73 and predicts 317,800 for 1973/74 and 317,500 for 1974/75. Since these figures are contained in a document dated October 29 - November 1, 1973, one would imagine that the 1973/74 data should be reasonably accurate. In point of fact, 1973/74 data enrolments will be up, not down; and before the ink on the document has had a chance to dry the prediction is out by 15,000 students, an error of about 5%. The error will increase for 1974/75 when the estimate will almost certainly be too low by 25,000 students. If it is so impossible to predict the total number of students accurately, predictions concerned with the distribution of students in various faculties, schools and programs become valueless. We cannot accept "planning" based on such information.

150. It is likely that the present relatively unplanned admission of students will produce more PhDs than there are immediate jobs for in the universities. We have already discussed this problem and concluded that there are manifest, even increasing, opportunities for the products of history graduate programs outside teaching altogether (paras. 53-55). With so new a market opening, it would be even more ill-advised to attempt to control intake by some mathematical formula based on job expectations. In any case, the worst outcome of all would be a situation resembling that of the sixties when new posts had to be filled from an insufficient reservoir in Canada. No one can now say whether at least modest expansion will not resume at some future date, and natural causes will in any case create an unpredictable number of vacancies. The present number passing through to the PhD is not excessive (para. 55), and we see no occasion to restrict it. On the

contrary, as we have said (paras. 136-138), we see no reason why it should not be slightly enlarged if suitable students present themselves. We reject the application of artificial restraints on the admissions policies of departments that have generally shown themselves to be responsible and even conservative in such matters.

(b) The Future of Graduate Programs

151. In view of all that we have said, this is a simple enough issue. We have found all existing programs for both the MA and the PhD to be satisfactory and some of them excellent. All should be continued.* At the same time, we see no reason in the foreseeable future why departments that do not now offer the PhD should think of doing so; the present programs provide all that is needed, especially if York moves nearer to its proper potential. The departments at Brock, Lakehead, Laurentian, Trent and Windsor do not yet command a sufficient variety of teaching and resources to create a viable program of fields for study, and we accept that they must be able to do so before a PhD program becomes possible. On the other hand, we think that Brock should seriously investigate the prospects for an MA program. We have already stated our conviction that a department without some form of graduate teaching does not fulfil the necessary qualifications of a university department, while the demand for the modest further education provided for by the master's degree is active and likely to grow.

152. One side of this demand to which we have so far given little attention is that of part-time studies (but see para. 39). In principle we do not like to see what may be called ordinary students - those coming on pretty immediately from the BA - undertaking their studies part-time; for them the business of proceeding to advanced status should exclude all other activities. As a rule, their age will ensure that it does so. PhD courses, in particular, are ill discharged on a part-time basis; the student who has to run at the work of serious research at interrupted intervals always finds that he needs a long and wasteful period to wind himself up again. We fully see that there will always be some students for the PhD who, after starting full-time, will

*We have given our general reasons in para. 101. They apply, of course, also to such at present small-scale programs as those at Guelph and Western where valuable traditions of local specialization are developing. We wish to point out that the abolition of any existing small programs would, in view of the size of undergraduate programs and the continuance of graduate student demand, save at best a minimal sum.

have to change to part-time status, but we believe that our proposals for a shortened course of study will reduce the likelihood of this, and we hope that departments will find themselves increasingly less ready to permit the practice. In short, the fewer part-time PhD students the better, and for preference none at all. On the other hand, there is a good case for part-time study for the MA, especially for students that treat the degree as terminal. The two chief sources of supply here are schoolteachers, who wish to improve themselves and their qualifications, and persons in employment who want to follow a serious personal interest. Course-work can certainly be done well on a part-time basis, and even the modest MA dissertation is less troubled by the sort of problem which part-time study poses for the PhD student. There are signs that the number of people of relatively advanced years who wish to study for the MA but can do so only if they are allowed to attend part-time is on the increase. We welcome this as an indication that higher standards of education are penetrating society in general. Thus we would encourage the provision of part-time MA programs for "non-ordinary" students wherever such a demand shows itself, but we would advise all departments except those likely to specialize in this form of instruction (Lakehead, Laurentian, Wilfrid Laurier) to keep an eye on proportions. Part-time study should be the preserve of an exceptional minority.

153. We have already explained (paras. 77-84, 97-100) that on the whole the areas of history studied in the province are acceptable, but we should like to see certain positive policies adopted in the future. We do not recommend direction to departments or allocation of given studies here or there: history does not work like that. However, departments may be advised that on the whole they are weak in the history of Asia and Africa, that the decline of British history (with its accessible and highly instructive variety of periods, themes and aspects) needs arresting (the pendulum swung back in the USA more than ten years ago), and that the history of western Europe, at the graduate level, needs to become more than the history of France. We recommend:

(i) The bringing into programs (at MA, field study and dissertation levels) of as large a part of each department's teaching strength as can possibly be managed - and that quickly;

(ii) individual surveys within departments of the teaching areas covered and a recruitment policy based on that self-assessment;

(iii) a conscious effort to develop aspects of history not covered by Toronto.

We would point out that in several departments the result of all this would be to strengthen Canadian history. In this connection we wish to emphasize the need for Ontario history departments to think of themselves as what they are - the main body of historians in Canada. They therefore need to do more to cover Canada outside Ontario and Quebec. We find too few experts in Western and Maritimes history, a situation calling for urgent remedy.

154. The points of the preceding paragraph may also be treated as advice to students. Those wishing to pursue an academic career could be well advised to think about those insufficiently covered areas or those rare aspects of familiar themes.

155. We do not wish to see history organized on some regional basis; every department should indeed continue to be able to stand on its own feet as a rounded representative of history in general. The only regionalism we favour touches subjects of research. The encouraging starts made at Queen's, Western and Guelph, in collecting local material and investigating local history, should be followed up there and elsewhere. What is needed is the sort of local history propagated in England by W. S. Hoskins or H. P. Finberg, in and for France by Georges Lefebvres and Charles Tilly, or in the United States by a host of historians: history which studies the universal problems on a regional canvas. There is much to be done there in Ontario, especially if the new techniques of investigation are brought into play.

156. This brings us to the question of methods and approach. As we have stated several times, despite the encouraging ambition of some departments and many younger historians to break out of strictly traditional forms of historiography, the scene for the present remains rather dominated by political history of a conventional kind, especially but by no means only in Canadian history. It is clear that this will change with time (except perhaps at Queen's), as younger men replace their seniors, and it is therefore now necessary to utter a word of warning. In fifteen years' time, it is likely that hardly anyone will think political history - the history of society in political and governmental action - worth attention; a new orthodoxy is about to establish itself which sees social analysis and the history of people's ideas as the only subjects fit for study. The process is already complete in the USA, with pretty disastrous consequences for the historians there who now spend more time inspecting their own livers and attacking one another's interpretative "theses" than in finding out about the past. Canadian historians will be well advised to avoid falling from one extreme into another; that is a habit which they might as well let stand as the characteristic behaviour of intellectuals in the United States. In the last analysis, history must concern itself with men and women doing things through time, and much of what they do concerns government and politics. If the present move towards social, intellectual and psychological analysis results in a more profound and better understood reconstruction of past events, all is well; if it drifts off into historical sociology or abstract philosophy (or, worse, into arguments about methods), it will quickly lose touch with reality and cease to be history. The virtues of the new questions and the sophisticated techniques lie in the improvement and the enlarged conception they bring to history, and history without events is not history at all. We do not wish to burden this report with a general discussion of the principles and philosophy of historical studies, but we think it necessary that enthusiasm for the new, very necessary in Ontario at this time, should operate in full awareness both the pitfalls of the new and the excellences of the old.

(c) Teaching Structure

157. We have explained at length how we would like to see PhD programs reformed so as to become shorter (paras. 87-96), and we here only draw attention to the analysis presented in Part II, Sections C and D. But one point needs additional emphasis. If Canadian historiography is to scale new heights, the impetus will have to come not so much from teaching as from the work of research and writing - from the scholarly labours of the faculty which in due course will be reflected in the teaching they provide for their students. It is time to say a good word for "a man's own work". Of course, it should not be allowed to supersede his obligation and desire to teach, but neither should his work as a teacher end his activities as a scholar. In the Ontario universities the second is at present a more serious danger than the first. We know too much about academic societies to apply simple measurements of published work or work in progress to any judgment of quality in faculty members. However, we have been struck by the fact that a large part, possibly a majority, of historians in the province are not what one might call oriented towards research. Devoted to their function as teachers, they do not possess quite enough of the passion to find out and to tell. To an extent this desire gets overlaid by daily labours and by the ethos of departments involved so much in teaching. However, we are of the opinion that a lack of research orientation has direct effects on teaching, inasmuch as it lures the teacher into becoming an instructor instead of a companion in the voyage of discovery. Once again, a thing of virtue looks like getting out of balance, and we should like to see some shift over to the other scale. In practical terms, this means giving more attention to the research side of the teaching done, by more intensive supervision of dissertations (para. 94, ii) and the organizing of more regular get-togethers for purposes of research - the teacher's as well as the student's (para. 95). It may also in some suitable cases mean the putting together of research teams, as for instance the group of historical demographers at McMaster. In the conditions set by the size and interests of departments in the province, it means above all more cooperation with other departments and other universities.

(d) The Future of Cooperation

158. All developments to be suggested are governed by the consideration that they must be carried out with present resources. We do not envisage any early prospect of major additions, but believe that what exists could be more thoroughly exploited by working together.

159. We would once again emphasize the need to break down the barriers between departments. Admittedly, giving greater reality to faculties (para. 103) may not be sufficient: the notorious, and rather silly, debate whether history belongs to the humanities or the social sciences

arises only because the subject has to have the closest contacts with both. But above all historians in history departments must work hand in hand with genuine historians in other departments. We envisage cooperation taking this form rather than genuinely interdisciplinary studies which are appropriate on occasion, and for the occasional student, but are not suitable as a basis of historical studies in general. It would help if persons practising history among economists or political scientists, or linguists for that matter, were brought into the planning of graduate programs; and if this can be achieved only by cross-appointments we would like to see a more lavish use of that device. The people to benefit most would probably be the outlying historians, restored to the milieu of their proper discipline, but the departmental core should not underestimate the advantages accruing to it. In general, the highest degree of flexibility consonant with the existence of order should be introduced; active personal relations should increasingly be reflected in formal participation in history graduate courses by all who claim to be historians in a given university. As for interdisciplinary studies, we should like to see such existing examples as the Victorian Studies Program at Toronto and York, or the Scottish Studies Committee at Guelph, copied after careful exploration of the ground. Queen's could institute a program of war studies, calling geography and the social sciences to the aid of history (and perhaps calling in the Royal Military College?). Ottawa could build a specific graduate program around the Centre for French Canadian Civilization. Toronto could turn some of its more tenuous centres into cooperative interdisciplinary programs: we are thinking in particular of the group interested in Renaissance studies. McMaster has the means for offering an interdisciplinary program in English history and society.

160. The area of cooperation most attractive to us lies, however, outside the sphere of formal recommendations. We should like to see scholars more active in meeting one another, in regular societies or discussion clubs, preferably bringing their most advanced students into the body of the kirk. The splendid Eighteenth Century Society at McMaster offers an encouraging model. This is a suggestion which we must leave to individual zeal and initiative.

161. As for cooperation between universities, we should hope to see this developed in three possible ways, none of them designed to create specialized regional centres to the detriment of individual or departmental autonomy, but all meant to secure the maximum use of available resources.

(i) Joint programs (on the model of the Reformation Consortium at Waterloo and Guelph). E.g.: Toronto and York could produce a program in Ontario/Quebec history; Carleton and Ottawa could find an area of bilingual studies within Canadian history which would broaden the former's concerns and supply the deficiencies in English interests encountered at the latter; the materials for an intensive program in English history from the Middle Ages onwards exist at Western, Guelph and McMaster (possibly with Waterloo), if

all were to work together. We envisage that students would remain registered at their parent university but would take instruction from teachers at any of the cooperating institutions; they would thus have a wider choice of fields and research subjects than one place can offer, and the possibility of genuine seminars (however occasional) would be greatly increased. We do not suggest that everybody should throw himself into this kind of arrangement, but we would hope to see two or three more such programs started within the next five years.

(ii) Greater use might be made of experts in another university in the supervising of PhD dissertations (as at present only at Queen's). This would help people teaching in departments that do not offer the PhD. One wants to avoid overloading the outstanding men who already tend to supervise largish numbers within their own departments; but it should be said that Ontario historians tend to think themselves overloaded in this way rather more easily than people working (to cite examples...) in England or Quebec. We frequently heard that no man should have more than two or three dissertations to supervise at any given moment; we think seven or eight perfectly possible and not excessive.

(iii) We would like the universities to explore the possibilities of sending students to other institutions for part of their work, at least for the PhD, both to study fields and perhaps to be supervised. Sometimes the right man for part of a student's interests just happens to reside elsewhere, and in a single province containing so many universities it should be possible for a student to work in another institution but be credited for the degree of his parent institution. If the study of fields is as justified as is maintained, efforts to exploit the variety available would be worthwhile; and some students temporarily away from base in order to work in an archive can at times benefit from the supervision of a local scholar.

(e) The Language Problem

162. We have not yet said anything about the problems posed by students who are so often to all intents resolutely unilingual, and here we can do no more than draw attention to it. Most departments have a notional language requirement upon admission which is nearly always satisfied by a reading knowledge of French, though at Guelph it is more likely to be German. Ability to speak this second language, however, is another matter. Students (and their guides, too) should be aware of the fact

that an Ontario PhD in history who is able to lecture in French would very likely have an open entry to jobs in the province of Quebec, while the known government policy of staffing higher ranks in the civil service with bilingual persons ought to make more impact on graduate students than it does. These practical considerations apart, we feel grave misgivings about a body of history students effectively unable to master the literature in most of the major languages of the world. Languages are to the historian a more important tool than statistics or methods of quantification; yet one hears far less about them. We recognize that the main fault lies with a school system which fails to ground children in the rudiments of foreign languages (indeed, even in their own language), and we also know that the problem is universal throughout the English-speaking world. Still, it is worth pointing out that the special situation created by two communities with different languages coexisting in one country offers special problems as well as opportunities to the historians of Ontario.

(f) Libraries

163. As has already been pointed out, the future situation in all libraries, the world over, is going to be very straitened. Book prices and serials subscriptions will unquestionably rise further, quite possibly much further. They will certainly rise at a rate of increase higher than anything that has yet been contemplated for library budgets. The consequences are much too obvious to spell out and have in any case been mentioned already (para. 124). At the same time, rising prices will make it more difficult for individuals to keep up their private libraries, which will make the resources of universities even more important. Therefore, if historical scholarship and advanced teaching are not to grind to a halt (and in the circumstances this is a real possibility) two things must be done. In the first place, the financing of libraries must be seen in quite a new light, comparable at least to the maintenance of major laboratories. This is not at all unreasonable: society has hitherto got the advantages of having historians (and other humanists) work for it at a cost which by comparison with the demands of hard - and soft-ware consuming disciplines is risible. Secondly, the beginnings made to coordinate purchases of expensive items, so as to avoid needless duplication, will have to be pursued further, preferably in a scheme covering all university libraries in the province except that of Toronto which should remain on its own as a reasonably complete depository. At the same time, we would warn that this specific has strict limits: there are many books (most of them now expensive) which must be in every or nearly every library if the work of historians as teachers and scholars is to be possible. Thus the provision of additional money is essential. The purchasing power of university libraries must at any rate be restored to the 1971 level. Apart from the addition of two professors at Laurentian, this is the only call for more money that we make; and it seems to us quite inescapable.

V. SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS

(Numbers in parentheses refer to paragraphs)

General

1. We approve all existing MA and PhD programs (85, 102, 151).

2. We recommend the funding of the MA program at Laurentian, and of the PhD programs at Carleton and Waterloo (139-141).

3. We propose a major reorganization of work for the PhD (87-95; detailed summary, 96).

4. We favour the MA by dissertation (71-74, 76).

5. We recommend the virtual cessation of part-time study for the PhD and a close control over part-time MAs (39, 152).

6. We recommend that a much larger part of the faculty be involved in graduate teaching (17, 34, 153).

7. We recommend no limitation on admissions and would like to see a modest expansion of student numbers; the mandatory limit at Guelph should be removed (136-138).

8. We recommend that more aspects and areas of history be studied at PhD level, especially such as are not covered at Toronto (25, 101, 153).

9. We should like to see more intensive work in local history (155).

10. We recommend the setting up of more advanced research seminars (96, 157).

11. We look for greater cooperation between history departments and historians in other departments (29, 103, 113, 159).

12. We recommend joint programs run by several universities (117, 159-161).

13. We advise history PhDs to seek more employment outside the universities (54).

14. We recommend a more consistent policy of student support and prefer to see more bursaries and fewer teaching assistantships (51).

15. We should like to see more student initiative in forming history societies and similar enterprises (57).

16. We urgently recommend an increased financial allocation to libraries, with a grant earmarked for the completion of serial runs (123, 134, 163).

17. We recommend that the Robarts Library be opened to all faculty and graduate students in the province (142).

Particular Departments

1. Brock: should move towards offering the MA (151).

2. Laurentian: should strengthen senior faculty by the addition of two French-speaking professors (139).

3. Ottawa: should promote more associate professors to full status (19) and manage to award more higher degrees (44).

4. York: should abandon opposition to expanding its graduate program and admit enough students to justify its very large faculty (43).

Words of Warning

1. Prevalent conservatism should give way to some dynamic advances (33-34).

2. New forms of history, while highly welcome, must be introduced with judicious care (29, 156).

3. Concentration on recent history is excessive and must be watched (26, 83).

4. Only an orientation towards original research can preserve the quality of the faculty and of its teaching (32, 157).

VI. CONCLUSIONS

The province of Ontario has a duty to maintain and assist the study and teaching of history in all its universities. The excellence of these institutions depends in great part on the health of that discipline, because of its special linking function in an age of increasing specialization, because of its own exceptional capacity to train minds and feed imaginations, and because of the large demand for it from students. In return, historians in the province owe a debt to the society which supports them - a duty they can discharge by giving the best possible teaching especially to graduate students, by producing well trained, sensible and sensibly critical men and women for the service of society in an increasing number of positions, and by keeping the study of history at the highest professional level. Beyond this, Ontario historians have a real duty towards the whole of Canada. In numbers and quality, they come first; here lies the essential core of the nation's, not only the province's, historical studies. Whatever Ontario does to improve the study and teaching of history will reverberate through the universities of other provinces, either directly through the colonizing activities of Ontario graduates or indirectly by example. This duty therefore involves not only the maintenance of standards achieved and continuous labours of improvement, but also somewhat paradoxically the abandonment of a too obviously Ontarian point of view. Historians in the province need increasingly to think in national and even international terms.

The foundations exist for a major world school of historical studies. History in Ontario is very much alive and pretty well. Indeed, it is better than its own practitioners seem to believe: we have never, in a fairly wide experience, encountered a less arrogant body of academics. But while we do not preach arrogance, we do expect to see selfconfidence and selfassurance where these are justified, as here they are. The older men have built well, and the younger men and women often show good signs of wishing to develop things further. At present the problem to confront is not that of creating reasonable quality, but that of the stagnation which achievement, and a sense of achievement, can bring. It is in this respect that we tend to distrust the conservatism met with in our travels. We have summed up our conclusions in the motto prefixed to this report. The good and sound standing of history in Ontario now needs to give birth to a phase of dynamic progress and proliferation. We do not need more numbers, but we seek more intensity and variety. Passionate research, ardent scholarship, explosive discoveries - those are the paths of the future.

APPENDIX I

TABLES

I

GROWTH OF FULL-TIME FACULTY

	1968/69	1969/70	1970/71	1971/2	1972/73
Bro	8	10	13	13	13
Car	29	33	36	38	38
Gue	10	11	13	13	15
Lak	9	10	11	12	11
Lau	10	12	14	13	12
McM	19½	20½	21½	22½	22
Ott	26	24	25	25	27
Que	22	24	26	26	28
Tor	59	58	68	64	68
Tre	11	12	13	13	13
Wat	18	22	25	32	32
Wes	27	27	30	33	36
WLU	8	9	9	9	9
Win	14	15	15	16	16
Yor	39	48	54	70	75
Total	309½	335½	373½	399½	415

II

FULL-TIME FACULTY BY DEPARTMENTS (1972/73)

	%
Bro	3
Car	9
Gue	4
Lak	3
Lau	3
McM	5
Ott	7
Que	7
Tor	16
Tre	3
Wat	8
Wes	9
WLU	2
Win	4
Yor	18

Group I (2%-5%)	Group II (7%-9%)	Group III (16%-18%)
Brock	Carleton	Toronto
Guelph	Ottawa	York
Lakehead	Queen's	
Laurentian	Waterloo	
McMaster	Western	
Trent		
Wilfrid Laurier		
Windsor		

III

GRADUATE FACULTY
(1972/73)

	Grad. Fac.	% of Province	Rank of Faculty Full	Associate	Assistant	Lecturer
Bro	-	-	-	-	-	-
Car	8	3.5	5	3	-	-
Gue	13	5.7	3	5	5	-
Lak	6	2.6	2	2	1	1
Lau	-	-	-	-	-	-
McM	16	7.1	6	6	4	-
Ott	20	8.8	3	15	2	-
Que	19	8.4	8	6	5	-
Tor	49	21.7	23	18	7	1
Tre*	3	1.3	3	-	-	-
Wat	18	8.0	5	13	-	-
Wes	25	11.1	5	14	6	-
WLU*	2	0.9	-	2	-	-
Win	8	3.5	3	4	1	-
Yor	39	17.2	11	14	14	-
Total	226	100	77	102	45	2

* Trent has 13 faculty and Wilfrid Laurier 9. Since they make no distinction between graduate and non-graduate faculty, the use of their numbers would have distorted the table. The numbers shown are of those who are at present working with graduate students.

IV

FULL-TIME FACULTY - PROFESSORIAL RANKS
(1972/73)

	Full	Associate	Assistant	Lecturer
Bro	2	5	6	-
Car	12	16	10	-
Gue	3	5	6	1
Lak	2	2	5	2
Lau	-	4	5	3
McM	6	6	9	1
Ott	4	15	6	2
Que	9	6	9	-
Tor	23	20	17	6
Tre	3	6	4	-
Wat	5	15	7	5
Wes	5	17	6	8
WLU	1	5	3	-
Win	3	6	2	4
Yor	13	23	22	16
Total*	91	151	117	48
	(22%)	(37%)	(29%)	(12%)

* The total adds up to 407 instead of 415. In this table, 2 professors from Waterloo and 4 from Queen's are missing. 2 of Toronto's 68 are visitors and therefore omitted.

V

DEPARTMENTAL DISTRIBUTION OF GRADUATE FACULTY (SENIOR RANKS) AND GRADUATE STUDENTS (1972/73)

	Faculty Numbers	%	Students Numbers	%
Bro	-	-	-	-
Car	8	4	26	3.3
Gue	8	4	29	3.7
Lak	4	2	5	0.6
Lau	-	-	-	-
McM	12	6	55	7.1
Ott	18	9	106	13.7
Que	14	6.5	96	12.4
Tor	41	20	244	31.5
Tre	3	1.5	5	0.6
Wat	18	9	76	9.8
Wes	19	9	57	7.1
WLU	2	1	7	0.9
Win	7	4	26	3.3
Yor	25	12	42	5.4
Total	179	100	774	100

VI

DISTRIBUTION OF FACULTY RANKS:
PERCENTAGES
(1972/73)

	1 Full	2 Assoc	3 1 & 2	4 Assist	5 Lect
Bro	15	38	53	46	-
Car	32	42	74	26	-
Gue	20	33	53	40	7
Lak	18	18	36	46	18
Lau	--	33	33	42	25
McM	27	27	54	41	5
Ott	15	56	71	22	7
Que	37	25	62	38	-
Tor*	33	29	62	25	9
Tre	23	47	70	30	-
Wat	16	47	63	21	16
Wes	14	47	61	17	22
WLU	11	55	66	34	-
Win	20	40	60	13	27
Yor	18	31	49	31	20
Ontario	22	37	59	29	12

* The missing 2% at Toronto are accounted for by visiting professors.

VII

FACULTY SPECIALISATION: REGIONS
(1972/73)

	Bro	Car	Gue	Lak	Lau	McM	Ott	Que	Tor	Tre	Wat	Wes	WLU	Win	Yor	Total
Canada	3	14	4	2	6	4	14	8	15	9	8	13	2	4	20	126
USA	2	4	2	1	2	3	5	6	11	3	4	8	1	2	12	66
Britain	3	12	5	3	1	5	3	7	14	3	7	7	1	4	9	84
Western Europe	6	14	2	4	4	10	9	10	21	7	12	12	4	4	24	144
Eastern Europe	1	2	2	1	1		4	3	6		7	2	1	1	9	40
Asia		2	1	2	1			1	4		2	3			5	21
Africa			1					2	1	1	2	1			3	11
Latin America		1	1				1	1	3		2	1		1	2	13
Others		1													5	6
Total	15	50	18	13	15	22	36	38	75	23	44	48	9	16	89	511
[FT Faculty	13	38	15	11	12	22	27	24	68	13	32	36	9	16	75	409]*

*To indicate incidence of multiple choices.

VIII

FACULTY SPECIALISATION: ASPECTS
(1972/73)

	Bro	Car	Gue	Lak	Lau	McM	Ott	Que	Tor	Tre	Wat	Wes	WLU	Win	Yor	Total
Intellectual	2	15	3	4	3	3	6	11	11	2	21	5	1	7	19	113
Social	5	23	7	6	6	5	16	16	41	3	25	19	2	10	42	226
Economic		10	4	2	2	3	3	6	12	3	7	12	1	2	20	87
Religious		13	4	1	1	1		7	11	1	8	4		3	5	59
Urban		5	1		1			3	2	2		3		2	2	21
Political	10	21	9	8	6	13	15	16	48	10	28	18	2	5	29	238
Diplomatic	2	5	1	3	1	2	8	5	17		3	8	1	2	6	64
Cultural	1	13	1	1		1	7	9	6	1	21	4		5	18	88
Military	1	4	1				1	3	6			4	1		5	26
Historiography		5	3	2		1	1	2	4		1		1	1	1	22
Local		5	2	1	2	2		3	4		1	2			1	23
Hist. of Science			1					1		1		1		1	2	7
Others			3					2				1			4	10
Total	21	119	40	28	22	31	57	84	162	23	115	81	9	38	154	984
Rate*	1.6	3	2.6	2.5	1.8	1.4	2	3.5	2.3	1.7	3.5	2.2	1	2	2	

* I.e. average of multiple choices per faculty member per Department.

IX

FACULTY SPECIALISATION: PERIODS (1972/73)

1. Ancient (to AD 400)
2. Medieval (400-1450)
3. Early Modern (1450-1700)
4. Modern (1700-1945)
5. Contemporary (since 1945)

	Bro	Car	Gue	Lak	Lau	McM	Ott	Que	Tor	Tre	Wat	Wes	WLU	Win	Yor	Total
1.			2		1	2					3	1			6	15
2.	1	2	2	2	1	2	1	2	6	1	5	4			5	34
3.	2	5	6	4	2	3		5	7	3	7	9	1	3	13	70
4.	11	30	11	9	11	16	26	20	55	12	26	31	7	15	58	338
5.		9	3	1	3		12	8	3	2	5	9	1	2	13	71
Tot'	14	46	24	16	18	23	39	35	71	18	46	54	9	20	95	528

X

FACULTY SPECIALISATION: PERCENTAGES
(1972/73)

Region		Aspect		Period	
Canada	25	Intellectual	10	Ancient	3
America (USA)	13	Social	23	Medieval	6
Britain	16	Economic	9	Early Modern	13
W. Europe	28	Religious	6	Modern	64
E. Europe	8	Urban	2	Contemporary	13
Asia	4	Political	24		
Africa	2	Diplomatic	7		
Lat. America	2	Cultural	9		
Others	2	Military	2		
		Historiography	2		
		Local	2		
		History of Science	0.7		
		Others	1		

XI

MA STUDENTS IN HISTORY
(1968-1973)

	1968/69			1969/70			1970/71			1971/72			1972/73		
	FT	PT	T.	FT	PT	T.	FT	PT	T.	FT	PT	T.	FT	PT	T.
Bro	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Car	19	7	26	12	8	20	11	13	24	8	12	20	15	11	26
Gue	21	1	22	23	0	23	22	4	26	8	9	17	12	3	15
Lak	1	-	1	1	1	2	-	2	2	2	3	5	2	3	5
Lau	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
McM	28	7	35	35	8	43	33	8	41	35	4	39	23	9	32
Ott	21	38	59	40	48	88	41	34	75	29	36	65	18	55	73
Que	19	14	33	21	14	35	23	18	41	27	13	40	14	20	34
Tor	50	16	66	45	20	65	49	23	72	58	20	78	56	25	81
Tre	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	7	-	7	4	1	5
Wat	24	20	44	39	21	60	50	30	80	41	37	78	40	34	74
Wes	16	21	37	20	18	38	26	12	38	27	18	45	30	12	42
WLU	6	5	11	2	8	10	4	7	11	5	10	15	1	6	7
Win	4	13	17	18	15	33	10	10	20	18	12	30	11	15	26
Yor	-	-	-	8	-	8	8	3	11	4	4	8	16	-	16
Total	209	142	351	264	161	425	277	164	441	269	178	447	242	194	436

XII

PhD STUDENTS IN HISTORY
(1968-1973)

	1968/69			1969/70			1970/71			1971/72			1972/73		
	FT	PT	T.	FT	PT	T.	FT	PT	T.	FT	PT	T.	FT	PT	T.
Bro	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Car	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Gue	10	1	11	8	-	8	9	3	12	10	3	13	9	5	14
Lak	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Lau	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
McM	15	2	17	19	5	24	20	5	25	25	4	29	18	5	23
Ott	18	13	31	9	16	29	13	16	29	13	15	28	13	20	33
Que	32	13	45	49	9	58	50	19	69	42	24	66	39	23	62
Tor	87	35	122	113	36	149	115	44	159	118	46	164	117	46	163
Tre	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Wat	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3	1	2
Wes	10	11	21	9	15	24	7	13	20	7	8	15	6	9	15
WLU	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Win	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Yor	-	-	-	9	0	9	16	1	17	22	1	23	21	5	26
Total	172	75	247	216	81	297	230	91	321	237	101	338	226	114	338

XIII

GRADUATE STUDENTS: TOTAL NUMBER
(1968-1973)

	MA	PhD	Total	ABDs	MPhil
1968/69	351	247	598	46	15
1969/70	425	297	722	50	18
1970/71	441	321	762	74	20
1971/72	447	338	785	71	19
1972/73	436	338	774	95	16

XIV

GRADUATE STUDENTS: PERCENTAGE INCREASE
(1968-1973)

	MA	PhD	Both
1968/69	100	100	100
1969/70	121.1	120.2	120.7
1970/71	125.6	129.9	127.4
1971/72	127.3	136.8	131.3
1972/73	124.2	136.8	129.4

XV

GRADUATE STUDENTS: DEPARTMENTAL DISTRIBUTION
PERCENTAGES
(1972/73)

	MA	PhD	Both
Bro	-	-	-
Car	5.9	-	3.3
Gue	3.4	4.1	3.7
Lak	1.1	-	0.6
Lau	-	-	-
McM	7.3	6.8	7.1
Ott	16.7	9.7	13.7
Que	7.8	18.3	12.4
Tor	18.5	48.2	31.5
Tre	1.1	-	0.6
Wat	17.0	0.5	9.8
Wes	9.6	4.4	7.1
WLU	1.6	-	0.9
Win	5.9	-	3.3
Yor	3.7	7.6	5.4
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0

XVI

DEGREES AWARDED
(1968-1973)

	1968/69			1969/70			1970/71			1971/72			1972/73		
	MA	PhD	T.	MA	PhD	T.	MA	PhD	T.	MA	PhD	T.	MA	PhD	T.
Bro	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Car	17	-	17	13	-	13	13	-	13	11	-	11	28	-	28
Gue	7	-	7	6	-	6	10	2	12	12	1	13	2	1	3
Lak	-	-	-	1	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Lau	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
McM	26	1	27	36	-	36	30	2	32	29	3	32	18	-	18
Ott	4	1	5	10	-	10	11	-	11	9	1	10	17	3	20
Que	7	1	8	6	-	6	11	3	14	18	5	23	10	3	13
Tor	32	5	37	33	12	45	54	6	60	22	19	41	43	10	53
Tre*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Wat	4	-	4	19	-	19	25	0	25	36	-	36	27	-	27
Wes	20	1	21	18	2	20	16	3	19	19	6	25	18	5	23
WLU	3	-	3	2	-	2	3	-	3	5	-	5	3	-	3
Win	9	-	9	11	-	11	9	-	9	8	-	8	13	-	13
Yor	-	-	-	4	-	4	6	-	6	5	-	5	3	1	4
Total	129	9	138	159	14	173	188	16	204	174	35	208	182	23	205

* The late return reveals 1 MA graduated in 1972 and 2 in 1973.

XVII

GRADUATE STUDENTS: ORIGINS
(1972/73)

		Immigration Status	Country of first degree: Canada	USA	UK	France	Asia	Other	Unknown	Total
MA Students	FT	Canadian	186	8						194
		Landed Immigrant	14	4	2		1	3		24
		Student Visa	2	12	5	1	1			21
		Other	1	1					1	3
	PT	Canadian	177	1						178
		Landed Immigrant	4	1	1	1	2	4		13
		Student Visa		1		1		1		3
		Other								
PhD Students	FT	Canadian	143	4	1		1			149
		Landed Immigrant	3	26	6		2	7		44
		Student Visa		17	5		3	6		31
		Other								
	PT	Canadian	92	4	2					98
		Landed Immigrant	2	5	4			2		13
		Student Visa		3						3
		Other								

XVIII

FULL-TIME GRADUATE STUDENTS:
SOURCES OF FINANCIAL SUPPORT
(1968-1973)

	1968/69	1969/70	1970/71	1971/72	1972/73
Central Mortgage and Housing Corp. Scholar[P]				2	2
Canada Council Fellow[P]	56	96	82	67	76
Ontario Graduate Fellow[P] (without additions)	34	58	60	43	26
OGF and Teaching Assistant[P] or Research A[P]	100	130	107	96	75
Other Major Scholarships ($2000 +)	26	40	37	43	37
CIDA	2	4	3	4	1
Foreign Government Supposer				1	
TA plus Minor Scholarship (- $2000)	10	6	4	14	26
TA plus Research Assistantship	4	3	9	3	6
TA only	39	32	69	111	79
RA only	3	14	12	13	24
Self-support	10	40	63	69	73
Other	9	9	6	26	26
Unknown	97	61	59	29	17

XIX

EMPLOYMENT OF PhDs 1968-1973
(INCLUDING ABDs FOR 1972/73)

	1968-1969			1969-1970			1970-1971			1971-1972			1972-1973		
Numbers Counted	9			15			16			35			115		
Employment*	Ont.	Can.	Ot.	Ont.	Can.	Ot.	Ont.	Can.	Ot.	Ont.	Can.	Ot.	Ont.	Can.	Ot.
University	5			7	3	1	8	4	1	12	13	2	36	34	3
Industry													1		
Government	2									2			8	2	
Community Coll. or High School									1		1	1	5	2	1
Fellowship													4	1	
Research													2		
Other							1						1	1	1
Unemployed	-			2						1			4		
Unknown	1		1			2			1	3			4		5
Total	8		1	9	3	3	9	4	3	18	14	3	65	40	10

* First employment, obtained within six months from graduating.

LIBRARY SUPPORT

No returns received in time from Laurentian University

	1 holdings books	2 holdings microform	3 serials held out of 175	4 %	5 % of runs	6 money spent average p.a. 1968/73 $	7 money spent budget 1973/74 $
Bro	24,315	(incl. in 1)	97	55	57	7,018	3,633
Car	74,644	162	134	77	55	38,816	N.A.
Gue	45,502	(incl. in 1)	111	63	74	28,552	24,500
Lak	25,275	280	85	49	68	20,820	8,350
McM	83,707	179	125	71	55	50,467	75,000
Ott	55,982	50,000	135	77	74	15,750	9,000
Que	57,897	227,034	129	74	85	65,459	57,000
Tor	177,193	7,324	148	85	92	1,741,684*	1,848,000*
Tre	30,568	N.A.	91	52	69	20,743	14,860
Wat	53,229	N.A.	116	66	52	50,507	47,000
Wes	88,938	676,626	138	79	78	N.A.	N.A.
WLU	18,867	42,664	79	45	62	9,969	14,000
Win	39,537	1,900	123	70	78	49,590	ca. 30,000
York	104,615	678,634	132	75	50	32,145	22,000

* presumably the total university library budget.

N.A.=not available.

APPENDIX II

INDEX OF DEPARTMENTS

Figures refer to paragraphs
All express references

Brock: 16, 41, 62, 63, 86, 151

Carleton: 15, 16, 19, 24, 34, 41, 44, 68, 69, 70, 72, 73, 86, 90, 99, 101, 104, 107, 119, 128, 136, 141, 161

Guelph: 29, 41, 49, 69, 70, 79, 82, 83, 89, 90, 99, 103, 108, 116, 119, 122, 123, 124, 125, 138, 155, 159, 161

Lakehead: 16, 20, 34, 41, 49, 63, 64, 69, 70, 78, 79, 80, 81, 82, 83, 86, 123, 124, 139, 151, 152

Laurentian: 16, 20, 34, 41, 63, 64, 79, 80, 81, 83, 86, 136, 139, 151, 152

McMaster: 15, 16, 20, 29, 41, 43, 49, 58, 68, 69, 70, 72, 73, 79, 81, 82, 83, 90, 99, 100, 101, 103, 109, 119, 122, 123, 124, 131, 160, 161

Ottawa: 15, 16, 19, 23, 34, 39, 41, 42, 43, 44, 49, 58, 70, 78, 79, 80, 81, 83, 84, 90, 94, 98, 99, 101, 104, 110, 119, 128, 159, 161

Queens: 14, 15, 20, 22, 32, 33, 39, 41, 42, 43, 44, 49, 78, 81, 83, 84, 90, 99, 101, 103, 104, 123, 124, 129, 134, 155, 159, 161

Toronto: 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 20, 23, 25, 26, 27, 39, 41, 42, 43, 44, 48, 49, 69, 70, 77, 82, 83, 87, 89, 90, 99, 100, 101, 104, 111, 115, 120, 121, 123, 124, 128, 142, 153, 159, 161

Trent: 16, 22, 33, 41, 63, 69, 70, 86, 151

Waterloo: 14, 15, 19, 23, 29, 34, 37, 41, 42, 43, 44, 49, 58, 69, 78, 81, 82, 84, 86, 90, 98, 99, 101, 104, 116, 120, 123, 124, 126, 132, 136, 140, 161

Western Ontario: 15, 17, 32, 33, 41, 42, 43, 44, 49, 68, 70, 72, 73, 79, 80, 81, 82, 83, 84, 89, 90, 98, 99, 100, 101, 103, 112, 120, 122, 123, 124, 130, 134, 155, 161

Wilfrid Laurier: 16, 41, 49, 63, 70, 73, 81, 86, 104, 116, 124, 152

Windsor: 16, 41, 49, 58, 63, 68, 72, 78, 79, 81, 82, 83, 86, 120, 123, 124, 151

York: 14, 15, 16, 20, 23, 24, 28, 32, 33, 41, 42, 43, 44, 80, 82, 86, 89, 90, 98, 99, 100, 101, 104, 115, 122, 123, 124, 128, 134, 137, 151, 159, 161

A P P E N D I X B

DISCIPLINE GROUP RESPONSE

History Discipline Group Response to ACAP Consultants' Report on Graduate Studies in the History Departments of Ontario Universities

The Discipline Committee was pleased and flattered by the Assessors' view of the general good health of History in the Province. We applaud the decision not to engage in invidicus comparisons between institutions, but we wonder whether more explicit comment on quality, as distinct from quantity or structure, would not have been beneficial both to ACAP and to the graduate programmes themselves.

Some of the criticisms in the report will doubtless prod departments to greater efforts and some improvements. Nevertheless, there is a general feeling that if all of us were to adopt all the recommendations in the report the diversity and plurality of approaches, approved by the Assessors, would be restrained. And there is a general feeling that internal decisions as to the disposition of faculty effort toward, say, graduate or undergraduate activity are decisions about which the Assessors need not, perhaps, have made such confident judgments.

In all probability the Discipline Group would have been happier if the Consultants approval of all programmes and their encouragement of new programmes and the expansion of old ones had revealed more awareness of the general situation in Ontario. Whether a faculty member is "in serious danger of decline" without Ph.D. students, whether M.A. work is a necessity, whether a scholar can live by teaching alone, or whether his research must be accompanied by graduate instruction are matters of debate certainly but are also matters on which few members of the Discipline Group would speak so categorically as the Consultants, and some would deny altogether.

Members of the Discipline Group believe that the main criterion for the development of a graduate programme should be the good of the student, graduate and undergraduate, rather than the advantage of the faculty. They know that without additional manpower an expansion of time given to graduate instruction would worsen an already unsatisfactory ratio of staff to student in the undergraduate honours or specialist programmes; and they know that an expansion of graduate work cannot be made at the present time without (a) raiding each other, or (b) increasing the number of good students who choose graduate work in history as opposed to some other academic or professional career, or (c) lowering the standards for admission beyond their present satisfactory but by no means excessively demanding level. There is no evidence known to members of the Committee that good students are being rejected by the graduate programmes in history in the Province of Ontario and if expansion were merely to bring in less qualified students it would be self-defeating.

We heartily support recommendations designed to improve the infrastructure of graduate work in the Province; improve funding of students; greater support for research libraries; improved research grants; help for co-operative ventures, formal and informal, and the like. While we realize many of these are partly matters for internal University

consideration we would be delighted, too, if ACAP would plead their causes for the discipline as a whole with COU.

Finally, we strongly recommend that the Discipline Group should hold annual meetings in the future to continue discussions of policy so fruitfully begun in the past year.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1 and 2. There is general acceptance of these recommendations approving existing programmes and funding the one new M.A. and two new Ph.D. programmes already begun.

3. While the Discipline Group agrees that every Department offering a Ph.D. programme should give careful consideration to the Consultants' specific recommendations for reorganization some of us have strong reservations regarding the detailed proposals for abolishing course requirements, reducing the number of fields, and modifying if not abolishing the comprehensive examination. We all agree that every effort should be made to shorten the time it takes to complete the degree, but we are sceptical of hard and fast rules since the circumstances vary so much from individual to individual. Some students will be better prepared than others who have had less satisfactory undergraduate training. Some will take up research projects that require extra years in mastering new and difficult language and methodological skills. As for the regulations regarding fields and comprehensives we would argue that again there is no need for rigid uniformity in these matters and indeed something to be said for diversity.

4. We agree that no M.A. should be granted without a substantial piece or pieces of original research.

5. We agree to the virtual cessation of admitting candidates for part-time study for the Ph.D. All part time programmes should be strictly controlled and not permitted to drag on indefinitely. As for M.A. programmes we believe that part time work fulfills a real academic and social need.

6. There is little objection to the general principle of more faculty being involved in graduate instruction, but it must be subject to two important limitations, namely, student demand and the qualifications of the instructor, and the adequacy of financial support. As a general rule faculty who have not completed their own degrees should not be involved in graduate instruction and faculty should not undertake research supervision until they have shown evidence of successful publication.

7. Most of us agree there should be no artificial limitation on admissions, other than the maintenance of high standards of admission. Obviously admissions in every university can only be justified where the Department

has the facilities for the sort of programme that the applicant wishes to follow. Departments should also recognize their responsibility to advise prospective Ph.D. students of the state of the market for Ph.Ds. and to cooperate with the C.H.A. in this respect.

8. We approve of this recommendation urging a broadening of the range of Ph.D. fields, but doubt whether significant expansion could occur without additional faculty and library resources.

9. There is general assent to the recommendation favouring more emphasis on local history, although some departments indicate they already do a good deal of it.

10. There is acceptance of the recommendation for more emphasis on advance research seminars where this is practicable. In many cases, however, there will only be one or two doctoral candidates in a particular field at the same time which precludes the possibility of anything but individual direction.

11. The Discipline Group shared the Consultants' concern that there is too little cooperation on individual campuses and among universities. They suggest, however, that while the criticism is justified there is more cooperation than meets the casual eye. It is usually not institutionalized; it is the informal meeting, the suggestion to a student to consult in other departments, the curriculum committees planning new courses and programmes, the joint appointments between departments or even faculties that exist in many institutions.

12. The Discipline Group is sympathetic to the creation of joint programmes. It should point out, however, that joint programmes are sometimes difficult to administer and to maintain because of difficulties in securing adequate or equitable funding, adequate student supervision, and so forth. We encourage external theses supervision when it may be useful.

13. The Discipline Group agrees that History Ph.Ds. should seek employment outside as well as inside the Universities, and urge that students should be made aware of the other opportunities outside the University. It would help if government departments and the private sector were educated to appreciate the capacity and reward of the attainment of an advanced degree.

14. We too recommend a more consistent policy of student support than has been evidenced over the past few years in Ontario, and a more generous policy of continuing support to the end of the programme. We believe, however, that there should be no university or programme quota (which would reflect and impose a static system) but one which permits maximum student mobility, however valid the students' assessment of the appropriateness of quality of the programme selected might be. We also believe that teaching is an important part of a graduate student's education, and the provincially funded graduate student support - whether direct or whether through normal departmental operating budgets

should not remove the teaching assistant. We believe, however, that enough free funds should be made available that more students could finance their graduate education without having to take a teaching assistantship for more than one year.

15. We are agreed on the desirability of forming Graduate History Societies and similar enterprises, but recognize there is a limit to the time most graduate students are prepared to devote to such projects.

16. We all strongly agree with the recommendation for additional library support.

17. We recommend that all University and public libraries, archives and inter-library loan sources in the province be open to all members of faculty and graduate students. We recommend that all such libraries and archives also make it possible on request for visiting scholars to sit in residence - i.e. secure working space within the stacks during research leaves or vacations. We recommend that all departments of history facilitate such research visits, perhaps through the allocation of office space and secretarial assistance to visiting scholars.

APPENDIX C

UNIVERSITY COMMENTS

Comments appear from Carleton, Guelph, Lakehead, McMaster, Ottawa, Queen's, Toronto, Trent, Waterloo, Western Ontario, Wilfrid Laurier, Windsor and York.

CARLETON UNIVERSITY

RESPONSE TO HISTORY CONSULTANTS' REPORT

This Report is very general in nature. Essentially it finds that graduate studies in History in the province are thriving and it accepts the status quo. Because of the generality it hardly calls for a detailed reply and we wish to raise only points of particular concern to Carleton.

1) The assessors could have been more critical in their examination of individual university programs and some kind of comparative evaluation should at least have been attempted. Moreover the exercise would have been more useful for universities if the Consultants had derived from their review of existing and prospective programs some specific suggestions as to ways to improve the quality of the doctoral education in History in Ontario.

2) While there is some merit to insisting on the importance of thesis work in history, it is debatable whether the English tradition of doctoral work, based exclusively on thesis work, represents an optimal arrangement. In the same vein, the recommendation that M. A. work be available only with a thesis component would appear not to recognize the flexibility and depth in research training provided by research seminars. The amount of published material which resulted from such seminars at Carleton over the years would lead us to question this hypostasis of the thesis.

3) Degree programs by part-time work is discouraged by the Consultants. This is a view that Carleton cannot concur with. We have had a long experience with part-time graduate studies at Carleton and it is our considered view that work of the highest quality can be done part-time. Indeed in other ACAP reports, Carleton's flexibility on this count has been praised and the very high quality of our part-time graduate work has been recognized. We feel that the views of the Consultants on this point are not borne out by our experience. Currently there is a small number of part-time students in the Master's program of History who are closely monitored and supervised.

4) The consultants' concern over the length of the Ph.D program, expecially the pre-preliminary examination period and the possible over-emphasis of the preliminary examination, is well taken. In our program we have taken steps to limit the time period and we believe we have reduced the spectre of the examination to a proper proportion which commands respect but not awe.

5) We heartily endorse the Consultants' emphasis on the role of the library as an essential tool for graduate research and effective graduate teaching. A good and growing library is the sine qua non of a flourishing graduate program in History.

6) We welcome the recommendation for the funding of Carleton's doctoral program and the recommendation for more co-operation between Carleton and the University of Ottawa. Co-operation and joint work is going on and it is possible for students at either university to take one or two courses in their program at the other institution. The Journal, l'histoire sociale/Social History, provides further evidence of this cooperative effort. The Consultants' would seem to have taken little notice of the extent of existing co-operation.

7) The Consultants have not provided a view of History which takes into account the diversity of approaches and directions now represented in History Departments and in related areas of the University like Departments of Classics, Economics, etc. The very position of the discipline at the crossroads of the Humanities and of the Social Sciences might make balanced assessment more difficult but all the more important.

G. R. Love
Vice-President
(Academic)

April 29, 1974

UNIVERSITY OF GUELPH

Comments on Consultants' Report

History Planning Assessment

Haec olim meminisse juvabit.

It is pleasant to acknowledge the receipt of a well thought-out and well written report. The consultants are to be congratulated. The introductory eleven pages on the study of history, though they contain some controversial points, comprise an essay which provides a helpful background for the remainder of the report.

We are particularly pleased that the consultants discuss, in paragraph 138, the limit of 15 placed upon the number of students in the Guelph PhD program. We urge that the ACAP and COU reports specifically draw the consultants' recommendation 7, page A- 73, to the attention of the provincial authorities with a view to the removal of this limitation.

The consultants in this assessment have devoted much more attention than any others thus far to libraries and the serious problems of acquisitions which they face. It is gratifying to find words of praise in paragraph 125 about the Guelph library, and in paragraph 126 about the spirit of cooperation existing between librarians and historians.

In several places there are misinterpretations or errors of fact which must be noted, as follows:

(1) In paragraph 69 it is correctly reported that Guelph insists on a dissertation for the MA. The "provision (that) exists for obtaining the degree without one" is a University position that permits a department such a program. The History Department prefers not to offer this alternative.

(2) In paragraphs 69 and 70 references to semester courses at Guelph do not make clear that a semester course is a half-year course. Thus the four semester courses at Guelph would be the equivalent of two full year courses at other universities.

(3) In the matter of historiography (paragraphs 82 and 89) opinions may differ. But in any case, it is a matter of fact that only one student to date has had to make good the lack of a reasonable equivalent.

(4) Paragraph 116 describes the Guelph-Waterloo Consortium in Reformation History, and incorrectly indicates that the Consortium offers graduate degrees. In fact, the arrangements provide for voluntary cooperation in graduate instruction and research in existing programs. It is not, in the special sense in which the term is understood, a "joint graduate program".

(5) A matter in which the credit belongs elsewhere (possibly Waterloo) is that of German as a second language (paragraph 162). At Guelph, as at most other universities, French is commonly the second language.

By way of general comment it is interesting to read, in paragraph 92, about the "tribal rite" of comprehensive examinations. The term itself is awkward; it is interpreted by some to refer to the comprehensiveness of the student's background, to others it is regarded as a test of the student's comprehension. The exercise, when not properly handled, can be a real hurdle requiring patient preparation. But when properly handled, and viewed as qualifying examinations,the exercise can be a useful check-point. By the time the examination is taken the student should have made at least a start on his research, and to the extent that he has shown signs of ability he may be deemed qualified to continue. The alternative of permitting the indifferent student to plod onward for three or more additional years, and

then to fail him at the end (paragraph 93) is a waste of time, and energy, and money.

The consultants' summary of reforms in the PhD program (paragraph 96) is generally praiseworthy, although for the North American job market two fields (ii) are likely to be insufficient, three fields are needed. It seems strange, moreover to note the implied division into two parts: one year of study of two fields, three years of research. Especially where, as in (iv), the fields are "to touch upon the student's research interest" it would appear possible to begin the research much earlier than the "thirteenth" month.

In paragraphs 47 to 52 the discussion of graduate student support is interesting but it includes some statements which appear to be based on misapprehension of the facts. Thus, about the middle of paragraph 51, the reference to universities supporting "students out of their own operating revenues" might be applicable in some other jurisdictions but not in Ontario. Operating revenues, as the term is usually understood, cannot be used to provide scholarships, they may be used only to pay for services rendered (as graduate teaching assistants). And for the latter the stipend is far from the $4,000. p.a. suggested in paragraph 52. New devices must be found, and old ones refurbished, for the support of all kinds of graduate students.

The consultants' recommendation 5 and paragraphs 39 and 152 concerning part-time study are not altogether consistent with the universities' responsibility to attempt to meet the needs of those who, for good reason, cannot undertake full-time study. Aside from the problem of precisely defining part-time study, it is true that increasing numbers of qualified applicants seek to improve themselves in the only way open to them--by part-time study. We know there are hazards, but that ought not to deter

us from offering the chance.

Finally, having in mind the consultants' introductory paragraphs we urge that steps be taken to acquaint the civil service, industry, school authorities, and other potential employers with the likely capabilities of history PhD's for appointments within their respective jurisdictions.

From the preceding paragraphs it should be evident that we find much food for thought in this report. The consultants have done the Ontario universities a service, and we are grateful.

****

May 1, 1974

TELEPHONE 345 2121
AREA CODE 807

Lakehead University
THUNDER BAY, ONTARIO, CANADA. POSTAL CODE P7B 5E1

OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

May 6th, 1974.

Dr. M. A. Preston,
Executive Vice-Chairman,
Advisory Committee on Academic Planning,
Ontario Council on Graduate Studies,
Council of Ontario Universities,
130 St. George Street,
Suite 8039,
TORONTO, Ontario. M5S 2T4

Dear Dr. Preston:

The Department of History has forwarded to me the following response to the Final Report on the History Planning Assessment. It is one with which I concur and may be looked upon as our official response:

"The members of the Department of History at this university express their pleasure that the Consultants' Report to ACAP contains such a well reasoned analysis of the discipline and its needs. They note particularly the perception and understanding of the problems of small universities which might so easily have been overlooked.

It is upon one or two of these problems that we wish to make some comment - comment that we believe represents rather an extension of the argument of the Report than any divergence from its spirit. In respect to library allocations, we find some ambiguity in comparing the general recommendation that the purchasing power of the 1971 library budgets be restored (para. 163) and the apparent justification of the decline in Lakehead's library budget, not only in purchasing power but in absolute figures (para. 124). We trust that the suggestion that Lakehead 'may perhaps now have found its more normal level' refers to a decade rather than any specific year, and that the intention was to compare the expansion of the 1960's with the realities of the 1970's.

The desire of this Department to move into dissertation work in British as well as Canadian History (which we have consistently expressed since our graduate program was being planned) has been given

LAKEHEAD UNIVERSITY

Dr. M. A. Preston May 6th, 1974

new encouragement by the Report. We have always believed that expansion into a second field is a necessity for survival. Such expansion along with increased enrolments on a part-time basis (as recommended in para. 64) and the maintenance of funding on the same basis as other institutions ought to make possible service to our community in the form of terminal degrees, increased analysis of the history of the region and the provision of M.A. degrees academically acceptable to the larger universities to which some of our graduates will apply for doctoral work.

Individual faculty members have expressed a number of views with respect to the major recommendations of the Report, but it seemed appropriate that the department as a whole should confine its observations to certain specific points of concern to us."

Yours sincerely,

ANDREW D. BOOTH,

President.

/lp

McMASTER UNIVERSITY RESPONSE

TO THE HISTORY PLANNING ASSESSMENT

In this report the consultants have attempted to present a truly Provincial view of graduate work in History. We are pleased that they have found the discipline to be in generally good health throughout the Province and we note with interest the focal role which they assign to History in the life of any university.

The report is very well written and conveniently indexed but we must express our serious disappointment over the fact that it presents no comparative evaluations of the different doctoral departments nor any summary statements on the strengths or weaknesses of particular programmes. To the extent also, that the report makes recommendations which in our view are poorly supported by the data then we must seriously question the worth of this report as a planning document. We will seek to underscore what we believe to be the shortcomings of the report by commenting on some of the specific recommendations that are made at the end of the report.

Recommendations 1 and 2, which approve all of the existing and proposed M.A. and Ph.D. programmes, and recommendation 7, which calls for an expansion of enrolments, take no account of the actual and potential need for History graduands in Ontario or in Canada generally. We submit that the report appears to be deficient in its consideration of the market implications of these recommendations. While we should not wish to see admissions to graduate programmes tied strictly to market demands for the graduands in any given year, we are of the view that some effort must be made to relate admissions

to the general employment situation, especially with regard to Ph.D. graduates in the Humanities. We find that the consultants' analysis of the employment situation (pp. A-26 to A-27) to be unconvincing in regard to any strong case for an increase in either the number of graduate programmes or the number of enrolments. Furthermore, the consultants themselves draw attention to the under-utilization of some of the graduate programme capacity already in existence (p. A-10). In summary, the consultants' carte blanche approval of existing and proposed programmes does not seem to be properly responsive to the need for planning in the discipline. We note that the consultants in one of their later recommendations (No. 12), do raise the question of joint programmes run by several universities but the recommendation is supported by only a series of suggestions and no specific proposals.

Recommendation 3 is based on a very detailed discussion of the structure of existing Ph.D. degree programmes in History. In some of the insistences there is a decidedly European flavour particularly with regard to the abolition of all formal course work in the Ph.D. programme but on the whole the analysis is sound and the criticisms perceptive. We currently have a departmental committee which is re-considering the question of our Ph.D. requirements and the comments of the consultants will provide valuable guidelines for this work.

The consultants' preference for the M.A. by dissertation is strong (recommendation 4), and we note in particular their assertions that our M.A. seminars are "regular courses, formally taught" (p. A-31) and that it is "problematical whether they (virtually all M.A.'s from McMaster) can be

regarded as anything more than over-developed undergraduates" (p. A-32). We can only counter by saying that the M.A. by course work programme has been carefully thought out and we do not believe that it represents a soft option for any student. On the contrary, every effort is made in the seminars to involve the student in research work and to encourage and demand at all times the highest possible levels of scholarship. In those areas where research materials are available, for example, Victorian Labour History, Ontario Demographic History, Ontario Local History, or Ontario Political History the students often obtain first-hand experiences in research. In other areas where our research resources are more meagre, for example, in most aspects of American History, the M.A. seminars focus more on historiographical problems. In completing the requirements for the M.A. by course work a student has to prepare as many as eight research papers and the high quality of work done in these seminars is attested to by the number of such research papers which have been published subsequently, several in Ontario History, the major journal of local history in the Province and others in U.S. and U.K. journals.

A greater emphasis on the M.A. by thesis programme does of course involve certain difficulties. For one thing, it stretches out the time involved in completing the Master's degree and, given restrictions on the length of time that the Province will finance a graduate student, this inevitably compresses the time available to later complete the Ph.D. degree. Further, our experience has been that the M.A. by thesis route inevitably results in a great deal of work piling up on the shoulders of the Canadian Historians while the other faculty members have few theses to supervise. One of the advantages of the M.A. by course work programme is that it does involve a far larger number of faculty directly in graduate work.

We concur with the consultants in their insistence that there should be no part-time study for the Ph.D. and a much closer control over part-time M.A. work (recommendation 5). McMaster has always discouraged part-time study for the Ph.D. degree and we intend to adhere to this policy. To date, we have had very few students interested in doing the M.A. in History part-time.

In regard to recommendation 6, we would note that we make no formal distinction between graduate and undergraduate faculty and that depending on their abilities and interests and on the students' needs all faculty members may participate in graduate work.

We support in principle the recommendation that more aspects and areas of History might be studied at the Ph.D. level (recommendation 8), and it is to be hoped that graduate departments will retain sufficient flexibility to allow them to introduce new areas as the opportunities arise. We should not wish to see the recommendation taken to mean that other Ph.D. departments should cover only the areas which are not covered at the University of Toronto.

In connection with the discussion of areas of History covered, we would note that "local history" has always been a prominent feature of our graduate programme and we are disappointed that this point was not acknowledged by the consultants. We also emphasize joint efforts with the Classics Department in Ancient History (cf. recommendation 11). In the field of Canadian History, McMaster has made recently two new appointments, one senior and one junior, to strengthen our work especially in the History of Social Thought and Urban History in Canada.

Recommendation 14 concerning student support has our endorsement. This University has a policy of offering scholarships and teaching assistantships to nearly all of our full-time graduate students and certainly to all such students in History. It is the case that any student may decline the teaching assistantship and still receive the scholarship component of the stipend.

UNIVERSITÉ D'OTTAWA
550, RUE CUMBERLAND

UNIVERSITY OF OTTAWA
550 CUMBERLAND STREET

OTTAWA, ONTARIO
Canada K1N 6N5

CABINET DU RECTEUR

OFFICE OF THE RECTOR

May 10, 1974

Dr. M.A. Preston,
Executive Vice-Chairman,
Advisory Committee on Academic Planning,
Ontario Council on Graduate Studies,
Council of Ontario Universities,
130 St. George Street, Suite 8039,
TORONTO, Ontario. M5S 2T4.

Dear Dr. Preston,

This is a reply to your request for the University's comments on the consultants' report on graduate work in History.

The University of Ottawa is in complete agreement with the general approach and tone of the consultants' report, which is most encouraging on the quality and place of the discipline of History in the universities of this Province and at the University of Ottawa in particular.

We realize that many of the specific recommendations in the report are addressed to the historians of the Province rather than to A.C.A.P. Our Department of History has already begun a close study of these recommendations. With most of them we have no significant disagreement, but there are two with which we must take issue.

The first concerns the comments on library facilities, particularly the statement in paragraph 127, that "most libraries are weak in their holdings of books and periodicals in any language except English". A considerable portion of Ottawa's library resources are in French. Among the 175 periodicals listed in the A.C.A.P. History check list, appear 43 French titles. Of these, the Ottawa University Library holds 18 collections which are 100% complete, four others which are 95% complete and an extensive representation of all the others.

The second is the suggestion that our History Department is French-speaking. While it is true that 75% of the undergraduate students taking History are enroled in French language courses, which in itself does not necessarily mean that their mother tongue is French,

over 60% of our graduate students in History are English-speaking. Among the twenty-five professors on the permanent staff of the History Department, English is the mother tongue of over 50% (13 professors). Among the 70 courses offered in 1973-74, 36 are in English (25 undergraduate and 11 graduate courses) while among the 64 courses planned for 1974-75, 33 are in English (22 undergraduate and 11 graduate). Among the 54 registered doctoral thesis projects in History, 26 are in English; and of the 110 theses completed and defended since 1960, 56 are in English. Given these statistics, it is impossible to accept such statements as "it should be noted that Carleton can and should provide an English-speaking balance to the predominantly francophone orientation at Ottawa" (paragraph 141) or "Carleton and Ottawa could find an area of bilingual studies within Canadian history which would broaden the former's concerns and supply the deficiencies in English interests encountered at the latter" (paragraph 161).

The History departments at Ottawa and Carleton have been co-operating for some years on such projects as the periodical, Histoire Sociale - Social History, of which Fernand Ouellet of Carleton is the editor and Julian Gwyn of Ottawa the assistant editor. Other academic plans for increased collaboration between the two universities are under discussion. However, none of these are based on the assumption that Ottawa's deficiencies in English interests would require special assistance from elsewhere. There may well be sound reasons to recommend a new Ph.D. programme in History at Carleton and it is far from our intention to express any views on Carleton's affairs in this matter. However, one of the reasons should certainly not be that the needs of Ottawa English-speaking population are being neglected by the University of Ottawa History Department.

Among their recommendations we would have liked the consultants to have laid more stress on the research and publication activities of historians. As in any other discipline, a professor of History teaching at the graduate level should be a publishing scholar whose own work has been submitted to the professional criticism of his peers and who is recognized by his profession for the high quality of his work. Although the report gave little attention to this aspect of the assessment, we hope that ACAP will not overlook this criterion of the quality of any discipline.

We should also like to compliment the consultants for drawing attention to the dearth of scholarships and of funds for research in History. We hope that ACAP will take heed of serious need for such funding in the humanities and at some time make special recommendations to the competent authorities on this subject. Graduate studies, however carefully planned, require adequate funding of research and adequate support of students if they are to be properly carried out.

Yours sincerely,

Roger Guindon

Roger Guindon, O.M.I.,
Rector.

copy: Dr. P. Hagen
Prof. J. Monet

QUEEN'S UNIVERSITY RESPONSE TO THE ACAP CONSULTANT'S REPORT ON HISTORY

R.L. MCINTOSH
Dean
School of Graduate Studies
and Research.

May 6, 1974

The statement on behalf of the Department of History concerning the Consultants' Report on Graduate Studies in the History Departments of the Universities of Ontario is presented under the following heads:

I. General Observations.
II. The Proposed Re-organization of the Ph.D. Programme.
III. Minor Recommendations of the Report.
IV. Errors of Fact.
V. Recommendation.

I. General Observations.

The dominant impression which the report leaves upon us is that the authors have ignored certain of their most important terms of reference and have thus failed, in large measure, to discharge the task which was assigned to them.

The purpose of the History Discipline Assessment was to provide an informed, independent evaluation of existing and proposed history graduate programmes in the universities of Ontario as part of the groundwork for planning and rationalizing graduate studies in the province. Accordingly, the consultants were requested in their terms of reference to "make recommendations ... which would indicate the desirable scale of graduate work in history in Ontario on the basis of foreseeable need ... and ... indicate the desirability of modifying or discontinuing some existing programmes or inaugurating new programmes or new kinds of programmes." Their terms further requested them to "make recommendations which would ... taking account of relative quality and other factors, indicate a suitable distribution amongst the universities of responsibility for programmes and for specialities where appropriate, including consideration of the need for any increase or decrease in the number of departments offering doctoral work and including consideration of areas of collaboration and sharing of facilities at a regional level and across the province."

What this language plainly called for was proposals based on a qualitative analysis of the strengths and weaknesses of graduate programmes,

existing and proposed, projected against a realistic background of demonstrated need and opportunity. What was required, in other words - and what the province was entitled to receive - was precisely the kind of rigorous and helpful comparative analysis that the consultants in Political Studies have produced. Regrettably, however, no such analysis is to be found in the report of the History consultants. In its place we are provided with proposals, in the consultants' two most important recommendations, that all existing graduate programmes be sustained and that three new ones be funded, and on the question of need we are offered the reassurance, altogether unsupported by convincing evidence, that the need for 15 M.A. programmes and at least 9 Ph.D. programmes in history in Ontario exists and will continue. This falls far short of what is required and was requested.

What is the explanation of this striking failure? It is to be found, we believe, in the reasoning processes of the consultants and, in particular, in their acceptance of a single, sweeping proposition which is laid down as the foundation of their report. "Teaching graduate students", they write in paras. 11 and 12, "at least up to the master's degree, is in general not a luxury but a simple necessity if the quality of the Department is to be maintained ... graduate programmes provide an inseparable advanced phase of that education which the Department exists to provide ... and without them the members of the Department are unlikely to maintain the qualities which make them good scholars and teachers."

This proposition should not be accepted without qualification. It is true, of course, that graduate teaching and supervision are stimulating to a professor, provided that the students are very good and the amount of supervision not excessive. It is equally true that many excellent and productive scholars and teachers have done little or no graduate teaching; that many professors find abundant stimulation in other sources, including association with colleagues, instruction of undergraduates and the challenging problems of their own research; that most undergraduates do not proceed into that supposedly "inseparable advanced phase" of their education and that, of those who do, many should be encouraged to move on to another university that

does offer graduate programmes. The proposition is, therefore, a sweeping half-truth and acceptance of it in this form would be bad enough. What is far worse, however, is the use which the consultants make of it in their report. There they advance it as fundamental doctrine and proceed to convert it into the major premise of a simple syllogism which, as they apply it to the problems before them, drives everything before it in a thorough-going rout of facts, judgment and reality. The syllogism is: teaching graduate students is a necessity for every department of history; all Ontario universities have departments of history; therefore, every department of history in the universities of Ontario must be able to offer a programme of graduate instruction. This is then held out as the justification for the full 15 M.A. and the 9 Ph.D. history graduate programmes for the province.

From the application of this rigid reasoning to the development of graduate studies in the province, two consequences flow - both of them bad, and both of them evident in the report, and especially in what is missing from the report.

First, it rules out the necessity, indeed the possibility, of the kind of qualitative analysis and evaluation of existing and proposed graduate programmes which the condition of graduate education in Ontario and the consultants' terms of reference alike require. In other words, this reasoning effectively prevents the consultants from coming to grips with the altogether important questions of whether all the graduate programmes, existing and proposed, are of approximately equal quality. Perhaps they are, but the report is conspicuously lacking in any analysis which demonstrates this to be true and which is based on a searching examination of such factors as : admission standards and their enforcement (we are simply told that all departments have "impeccable" admission standards); the optimum size of a graduate programme, both in faculty and students; the qualifications of the faculty engaged in graduate instruction; available library and archival resources; and the success in finding employment of those who have studied in the various programmes, especially Ph.D.'s and A.B.D.'s.

Second, the type of a priori reasoning which animates the report carries it out of touch with the real world confronting the universities and the government of Ontario. Among the realities which are thus obscured are the facts of deteriorating employment opportunities, contracting financial support for graduate studies, and graduate enrolments which are declining in quantity and

in quality. Instead of facing these realities and analysing their dimensions and their implications, the consultants merely offer us their assurance that none of these factors gives cause for alarm or supplies reason for retrenchment, and their assurance, soothingly repeated, is left wholly unsupported by convincing evidence. It may be conceded, as the report observes, that manpower planning is notoriously inexact, but this common-sense observation, unaccompanied by any analysis of the realities cited above, offers no support for even the "modest expansion" which the consultants predict.

II. The Proposed Re-organization of the Ph.D. Programme.

There is one other important aspect of the report on which we desire to comment in this place. It is the proposal, in recommendation 3, of "a major reorganization of work for the Ph.D." along lines which are summarized in para. 96 and which include, principally, the reduction of the number of fields to two of equal weight and the abolition of all formal course work of whatever kind. The purpose of the proposed re-organization is twofold; to cut down on what the consultants regard as an inessential part of the doctoral programme and thus to reduce the time required to complete the degree.

The consultants define as "the central problem" touching the Ph.D. the length of time it takes to complete it. They find that the average timespan in one Ontario university is just under six years and that this is common practice in the province. The cause of the problem they discover in another problem - this one labelled "fundamental" - to wit, "that the History Ph.D. in Ontario manages to combine the most time-absorbing aspects of [the British and American] systems" - substantial course and field study plus a substantial dissertation. To the solution of these two problems the consultants bring to bear their own convictions about the nature of the Ph.D. They believe it is properly a research degree, holding that the dissertation is "the core of every responsible Ph.D. programme"; that the doctoral student is, therefore, essentially a research student; and that extended labour on field preparation "frequently proves frustrating and tends to flatten the student's zest for the work" and "hinders his proper and rapid development into a

scholar capable of serious research." A logical application of these beliefs would have led the consultants to prescribe the elimination of everything but the dissertation from the Ph.D. programme. When, however, in the course of their travels about the province, they were met with a chorus of protest from faculty and students who saw high merit in the study of fields as a preparation for a career in university teaching, the consultants were brought at length to comprehend that the concept of the degree as a research degree, pure and simple, however acceptable in England, was "totally unacceptable" in Ontario. They were then able to temper their convictions with a measure of reality and to recommend, as a compromise, that the numbers of fields be reduced to two, and that all formal courses be eliminated, these coupled with the further recommendations that the time allotted for field preparation should "on no account" be permitted to exceed one year and that the timespan for the whole programme should normally be restricted to four years. The consultants see in these proposals the prospect of a considerable saving of time for the student.

The members of the Queen's Department of History share to the full the concern which the consultants express about the length of time taken to complete the doctoral degree, and we would welcome enthusiastically any practical proposals to this end. We are not persuaded,however, that the proposals presented in the report will achieve what is claimed for them. On the abolition of all formal course work, it is our experience that formal courses expedite, rather than impede, the student in the systematic and thorough preparation of his fields, and that the student comes to his field examinations better prepared on those portions of the fields which he has studied in formal courses than on those which have been left to his own independent study. (The elimination of all formal course work would remove, of course, a major source of that needed intellectual stimulation of faculty which the consultants, elsewhere in their report, hold to be the principal justification of graduate programmes for every department of history.) As to the desirable number of fields, there is nothing sacred, in our opinion, about the prevailing number of three, any more than there was about the earlier requirement of four, and it is irrefutable that a reduction to two would save

time. It is necessary to ask, however, how much time? The probable answer is at best, three to five months, and this out of a total degree timespan which presently averages nearly six years and which the consultants hope to reduce to a "normal" four years. Clearly the prescription does not strike at the heart of the problem.

The fact is that the consultants are gravely mistaken in their judgment that "this stage, before the student embarks on research proper, is in great measure responsible for the overlong Ph.D. courses in History." It is not this stage at all, but the second stage, when the student is engaged in the research and writing of his dissertation, which consumes by far the greater amount of time taken to complete the degree, and that for reasons arising from the real world of Ontario but imperfectly comprehended by the consultants. This can be illustrated by the experience of our own graduate students. It should be noted that Ph.D. work in History expanded very rapidly during the 1960s. Prior to that point the University of Toronto was the only Ontario university to have a large number of doctoral students. Our programme at Queen's remained relatively small until the mid-1960s. We have thus had a large number of Ph.D. students for only a decade. It became evident during this period of growth that our students were very much in demand as university teachers. They were often encouraged to take university posts with their doctoral programme still incomplete. This is a common pattern in the humanities, and, of course, added to the length of time required to complete degrees. During the recent past many of these students have in fact completed their programmes. One of the reasons for the expansion of graduate work during the 1960s was the need to produce university teachers for Canadian universities. Our students made a solid contribution in this area. Currently some thirty universities and colleges in Canada and elsewhere are employing recently graduated Queen's Ph.D.'s in history and doctoral students in progress. While we would like to see students in history complete doctoral programmes more quickly than has been the case, we do not agree that the consultants' recommendations will meet this objective.

III. Minor Recommendations of the Report.

The report contains, in addition to the three principal recommendations which we have treated above, some 14 others of distinctly lesser significance, all advanced for the general improvement of graduate education in history in Ontario. With many of these we agree, in some instances unreservedly, in others with reservation. We favour the M.A. which includes a dissertation. We agree that if part-time graduate study is to be further restricted, more money should be available to support full-time students. We also agree, as our developing programme shows, that more aspects and areas of history should be studied at the Ph.D. level, including more intensive work in local history. We, too, look for greater co-operation among History Departments and with scholars in other Departments. We will continue to advise History Ph.D.s to seek employment outside the universities, though few students appear to need this obvious advice. We, too, would like to see more consistent and more generous financial support for students, and we shall persist in seeking it wherever we can. We would welcome additional student initiatives in forming History Societies and any other kinds of intellectual intercourse in which students would like to engage. Increased financial support for libraries, including the completion of serial runs, would naturally benefit every university. As to the recommendation that the Robarts Library be opened to all faculty and students in Ontario, the passage of time and the wisdom of the University of Toronto have already overtaken the laudable desire of the consultants.

In thus endorsing several of the Report's minor proposals we desire to add a final caveat. Our endorsement is based solely on our judgment of the measure to which these proposals may usefully be applied - or given further application - at Queen's; it is not to be taken as approval of any blanket policy which would fasten these proposals on other universities which, like ourselves, have to decide for themselves on which, if any, of them is appropriate to their varied interests and circumstances.

IV. Errors of Fact.

The report, at least as it relates to Queen's, is marred by errors which, taken together, produce a distinctly false impression of what is being done here:

1. "... Queen's ... needs to enlarge the graduate faculty (perhaps by bringing more of the available teachers into the program) ...." (para.43). Of the 25 full-time members of the Queen's History Department, 17 teach or have taught graduate courses; in addition, 4 others supervise or have supervised graduate dissertations. Faculty participation in graduate instruction has thus reached 21 out of 25.

2. "Queen's, though it does not restrict itself to Canada, allows that history to predominate" (para. 78). Of the 14 graduate courses which our department offers, 4 are in Canadian history. Moreover, Queen's prohibits every doctoral student from taking more than one field in Canadian history among the three fields which he is required to prepare. Canadian history predominates only in the number of dissertations completed or in progress (83 Canadian and 72 in other fields from 1968 to 1973) and that only because Canadian history is the field in which a majority of our students have chosen to prepare dissertations.

3. Queen's is not, but should be, included in the list of universities (para.79) which "feel able to include the middle ages" in their teaching of British history.

4. Queen's is not, but should be, included in the list of universities (para.81) which teach European history in the middle ages.

5. Queen's is not, but should be, included in the list of universities (para.81) which teach Russian and Eastern European history.

6. Queen's is not, but should be, included in the list of universities (paras. 82 and 99) which teach African history; and it may be noted here, since it is nowhere acknowledged in the report, that Queen's ability to teach it effectively is enhanced by the possession of the best library collection in Canada of materials on the history of Southern Africa.

7. "The middle ages are not forgotten but they receive proper treatment only at Toronto, McMaster and Western, with a little help from Guelph (para.83).

"Only Toronto acknowledges the English or European middle ages..." (para.99). Several of our sister universities may desire to offer the consultants "a little help" in reconciling these two contradictory statements. We simply point out that Queen's offers a graduate course in the history of the later middle ages.

8. "Western and York allow Western Europe since 1700, as does Queen's with some reluctance" (para.99). The fact is that, of the 14 graduate courses offered by our department, 4 are in the history of western Europe, including Great Britain, since 1700. The imputation of a stubborn parochialism is both unfounded and insufferable.

9. "... it would appear that the teaching activities of History Departments involve little use of colleagues elsewhere..." (para.13). The Queen's Department, for the instructional purposes of our graduate programme, has drawn, or is currently drawing, on colleagues in the following departments at Queen's : Economics, English, German, Philosophy, Political Studies and Theology: and on colleagues in Anthropology (University of Toronto) and in History (Trent).

The appearance of errors of this elementary but damaging character in a draft report would have been surprising enough, in the present instance, in view of the fact that the right information was available to the consultants in the plenitude of data with which they were furnished by this University and all the others at an early stage in their inquiry. The presence of such errors in the final report, is not only surprising but very regrettable indeed, and all the more so since it is known that, at a recent meeting of the consultants with the History Discipline Group, convened to consider the draft report, the representatives of several universities, including Queen's, endeavoured in vain to obtain correction of glaring mis-statements of fact before the report was presented in its final form. In the result, tenacity in error has produced a document which rests on an extremely shaky data-base.

V. Recommendation.

Our view is that the Report is inadequate because of the consultants' failure fully to meet their terms of reference, their reliance on faulty premises and the fact that they did not take sufficient pains in using the massive quantity of data with which they were supplied. We have confined our illustrations of this last point to facts concerning Queen's.

We therefore recommend that no planning decisions be based on this Report. If such decisions are to be made we recommend that new consultants be appointed and a fresh Report prepared.

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO
School of Graduate Studies

OFFICE OF THE DEAN

Toronto 181, Canada

April 29, 1974

Dr. M.A. Preston,
Council of Ontario Universities,
#8039,
130 St. George Street,
Toronto.

Dear Dr. Preston,

The consultants' Report on Graduate Studies in the History Departments of the Universities of Ontario has been received with mixed feelings at the University of Toronto. It is highly informative in some respects and always readable, but a disappointing document on a number of questions which are important to the planning of Graduate Studies. The problems arise partly from a view of the discipline of history which appears to us to be unnecessarily defensive and one-sided and in particular from a lack of understanding of the nature of related disciplines, particularly in the social sciences. Many of their judgments of the institutions and programs are impressionistic in nature and do not give sufficient basis for University and system planning. And we disagree with their approach to the Ph.D.

Specifically, we dispute the view that "teachers of history do decline in quality if their whole professional lives are spent with undergraduates" (§11), and we take particular exception to the view that appears to make Ph.D. work a necessary stimulant to excellence for historians. We believe there is overwhelming evidence to the contrary in Canada, the United States and the United Kingdom insofar as history is concerned. Undoubtedly, good graduate students are stimulating, but indifferent ones are not and it is doubtful if a sufficient number of good graduate students can be found to provide such stimulation for all faculty members in all universities in the province.

The consultants urge an expansion of graduate work within existing resources, but they do not seem to have considered the resource implications for our undergraduate programs. Where existing faculty are already fully committed, any substantial increase in the number of graduate students without an increase in faculty must mean proportionately less attention paid to undergraduates. There may be enough slack to allow some expansion at the M.A. level without creating serious problems for undergraduate teaching. In addition, substantial expansion at the doctoral level should not be undertaken without better information and fuller consideration of the career opportunities for history Ph.D's.

It is unfortunate that none of the three consultants apparently had extensive training in a North American doctoral program in history. Some of their proposals for tightening up our doctoral programs deserve close attention, but there is a marked imbalance in some other major proposals on this degree.

The report is not, in our opinion, a cohesive planning statement. There is no comparative evaluation of the departments in the Ontario system, little guidance for individual departments and Universities as to the appropriateness of the plans they submitted, and the barest indications of the directions which specific departments should take in the development of their programs. It would have been helpful in all these respects if more consideration had been given to the qualifications needed for those who are to teach in a graduate program, if more of an attempt had been made to analyse the c.v's with which they were furnished and to give some information on the strength of the various departments in terms of publication, and if an analysis had been made of Ph.D. theses completed.

The recommendations:

1. For reasons already given, it is not possible from the information provided in the report to comment on the appropriateness of this recommendation.

3.(i) The abolition of formal course work seems too rigid an approach to the Ph.D. We believe that such a decision should be left to the discretion of the departments and, where formal course work is abolished, care must be taken to develop effective substitutes. We do not favour the abolition of both course work and comprehensive examinations.

(ii) The number of fields should again be a matter of choice. At this University we raised the number from two to three to help the student as a teacher, partly on the basis of feedback from other Universities where our students were placed.

(iii) We agree that everything possible should be done to reduce the length of time taken to complete the doctoral degree, but the length of time required to prepare the comprehensive examination must depend upon the adequacy of the student's previous training. Twelve months will often be insufficient for this.

(v) We strongly oppose abolishing comprehensive examinations. Their removal would make field preparation fairly meaningless and would eliminate an important method of determining whether a student is capable of going on to the full thesis.

(vii) While we support the principle of this proposal, we find that there are a number of factors working against early completion of the degree, namely employment of ABD's (now less frequent), inadequate financial support for the student, the necessity for off-campus research involving considerable relocation and re-orientation time, as well as the organization of work for the Ph.D.

(ix) We support this recommendation, but note the difficulty of mounting research seminars for students working on theses in fields where there are very small numbers.

4. The consultants are a little vague as to what they mean by an M.A. dissertation. If they mean no more than a substantial piece of original research of from 50-100 pages we have no objection since we have such a requirement, but we are opposed to prospective Ph.D. students doing an M.A. by thesis which is equivalent to two full courses in weight, since we have found that this generally lasts more than a year and lengthens the overall stay of the doctoral student in graduate school.

5. We are not sure that the consultants fully understand the distinction between full-time and part-time students. We do not make provision for part-time doctoral students in their first two years, i.e., the residency period. We might note here the puzzling remark in §36 to the effect that ABD's (and M.Phil candidates) make no measurable demand upon graduate instruction by the faculty. We presume that consultants are aware that ABD's make very heavy demands on faculty at the thesis-writing stage.

6. The Department would limit the number of faculty involved in graduate work to those who qualified and are needed, although if there are more qualified faculty than are needed consideration would be given to rotation of graduate courses. We regret that the consultants have not dealt with the question of faculty quality, particularly the qualifications needed by doctoral supervisors.

7. We see no problem with modestly increased enrolments, provided high admission standards are maintained. We would suggest that the discipline group discuss possible mechanisms for developing uniformly high admission standards across the province, on a voluntary basis. A warning should be made, however, that increased graduate enrolment particularly at the Ph.D. level might damage present undergraduate programs where excess capacity does not exist, and should encompass better information on career opportunities for history Ph.D's.

8. This recommendation is a sensible one, provided there is better guidance for advising departments on particular concentrations.

9. We agree with this recommendation.

10. See 3(ix) above.

11. We support this recommendation, but note that there may be more now than the consultants appear to realize.

12. While we support this recommendation, we should note that the success of joint programs in our experience depends very largely on the terms of the arrangement.

14. We fully agree with the plea for more consistent student support, especially the need of guaranteeing continuing support for the successful student, but we would be opposed to any serious curtailment to the employment of TA's which provides good experience to the graduate student within limits and is often essential to the health of the undergraduate program. The dangers lie in prolonged or excessive reliance, not in the concept as such.

17. Agreement on the co-operative use of Ontario University Libraries is under review both at COU and within the University of Toronto. The consultants have not, however, touched on the very complicated funding implications this recommendation has for the Universities involved.

Yours sincerely,

A.E. Safarian

A.E. Safarian
Dean

AES/leh

C-32

TRENT UNIVERSITY

Response to "CONSULTANTS' REPORT ON GRADUATE STUDIES IN THE HISTORY DEPARTMENTS OF THE UNIVERSITIES OF ONTARIO"

1. Introductory

The Consultants' Report was prepared under such pressures of time and with such limitations of detailed enquiry that it is surprising how comprehensive and useful it should prove to be. Responsibility for faults in procedure should be shared both by the Discipline Committee and the Consultants. If there is a single overall weakness in the Report it is probably the boldness of diagnosis and remedy based on what appears to be too little knowledge of the Ontario graduate system. None the less, much of the data assembled will prove of great value, and many of the judgements passed will at least provoke the Discipline Group to greater self-examination.

Although there is little in the Report with which a small university, with a small graduate programme such as Trent, could not live, that is not to say that we do not find grounds for criticism of the Report. There follows a brief comment on some points within the Report, prepared under the limitations of time set out in the committee's schedule.

2. De-structuring

The minimal structuring of our graduate programme at Trent does not conflict with the Report's proposal for substantial de-structuring of graduate programmes in History throughout Ontario. Most of us at Trent, however, are products of Ontario graduate programmes, and a number of us have taught within them. From that experience we may entertain criticisms of some of the highly structured programmes typical of North America, but we do not find it particularly helpful to be confronted with the general principle that these should be de-structured without fairly specific suggestions toward the accomplishment of such a goal. A large institution is no more inherently problem-ridden or less worthy than a small one. We find this section of the Report unconvincing.

3. History's Health

All historians and their departments in Ontario will be flattered and encouraged to think that they are found "healthy". The arguments for History's place in the university and for better funding are commendable. In Paragraphs 29 and 33, however, there seems some contradiction. We are accused of being conservative and failing to innovate, but we are warned not to go in for trendiness; we are found conservative, but we do not sufficiently pursue political history. We are not told how social and economic history "dehumanize" history (Para 29). What kind of M.A. dissertation is wanted - 100 pages (Para 71) or 60,000 words (Para 72)? Contradictions, inconsistencies, and unresolved definitions of this sort were spotted throughout the Report. It would not serve any purpose to review them further, except to point out that they do raise problems about the overall validity of the Report, and particularly about specific aspects of its implementation.

4. Scholarship and Graduate Studies

The consultants believe that "a Department whose work is confined to undergraduates lives in an artificially truncated condition" and that "whether or not they continue to pursue their own research . . . teachers of History do decline in quality if their whole professional lives are spent with undergraduates." These assertions are unsupported by either evidence or convincing argument.

In Paragraph 33 Trent is criticized for its lack of "dynamism". What the term means remains something of a mystery, and the failure of any of the consultants to visit Trent has naturally done little to enlighten them or us on that point. The Department would observe, however, that it was the first of the university's Humanities and Social Science departments to enter into graduate studies. Through its initiative special grants have been obtained from the Canada Council and other foundations for the purpose of building up the university's research capacity. The Department took the main responsibility for introducing an inter-disciplinary programme of Canadian Studies, one of whose main features is the encouragement of library purchasing and scholarly production in new research. It may also be seen from the curricula vitae of the members of the Department that there is a high and continuing rate of scholarly production amongst

virtually all members. Further, co-operation in scholarly and graduate work is strong between History, Philosophy, and Politics.

In a broader connection the subjective statement is made that there are not many people of distinction in Ontario history departments; we would point out that, of only 14 full-time historians at Trent, two are of such distinction as Professor W. L. Morton and Professor W. H. Dray. The remarks on the "quality and quantity" of senior faculty in Paragraph 20 seem inapplicable; moreover, in Paragraph 19 Trent did not fall foul of the objections to unduly heavy percentages at the higher levels, although our own percentage of senior staff is just behind that of Carleton and Ottawa. This is one example of the frequent failure to establish a relationship between text and statistics.

5. Statistics

The statistics frequently seem to mean very little, and the text can and perhaps should be read apart from them. For example, the authors themselves admit (Para 123) that the serials checklist was drawn up "rather haphazardly", but they then go on to draw apparently significant conclusions from them. Similarly, for the University of Toronto alone, the authors are aware that the statistics on full-time faculty are not very representative of the real state of History; with more attention to some other universities they might well discover that a similar situation exists in many other universities. The statistics on proportions of faculty at each rank surely mean very little apart from specific knowledge of each department. To assume that rank correlates with seniority and ability, as appears to be done in the textual interpretation of the tables, is surely to be simplistic.

Statistics on interests, periods, etcetera, are interpreted cavalierly in the text. Trent and Queen's are taken to task (Para 22) for including a high proportion of men professing more than one interest, but the same criticism ought then to be applied to Carleton, Western, and Waterloo to only a slightly lesser extent. The point itself seems dubious anyway, when one considers men whose research is in what we have chosen to call at Trent "connectional" history; or are the authors unaware that many people do research on links between two societies? It may be that many people are claiming more interests than they can really sustain in a research sense, but the statistics will not prove this.

The same figures (Table VII) are interpreted to mean (Para 23) that some departments give insufficient attention to certain fields. To say that York, with 9 in British History, is weak is to say that nearly everywhere else is weak too. Otherwise, the authors must go into details of why York's 9 cannot adequately cover a field that someone else's 2 or 3 are seen to cover adequately. Such use of statistics cannot yield evidence of what is not covered at all. Perhaps readers should not assume that the statistics mean much, or that they mean what the text says they mean.

6. Numbers of Students and Programmes

The authors call for at least a modest round of expansion in view of the importance they attach to graduate teaching. But there is no stimulus in supervising a weak student. Where is each programme to get its students, and what is to become of them? The Canadian Historical Association has been particularly concerned about this last point, urging universities to assume a greater sense of responsibility in encouraging students to undertake graduate studies particularly in certain fields. The Report recognizes these problems to a degree, yet it still takes the departments to task for "conservatism". Policy, however, probably has little or nothing to do with the problem, or departmental policy at least.

Again, responding to the criticism that we at Trent have not shown sufficient "dynamism", the consultants might imagine the invidious position we would be in if we were to take their criticism literally. Our interest in graduate studies is such that virtually all of us engage in its course teaching and thesis supervision as a matter of personal overload beyond a full undergraduate teaching load. Moreover, Trent's concern is to get more undergraduate students, and our department has assumed a major role in assisting toward that end. Our "dynamism" has been directed toward the Canadian Studies Programme during the past two years (but at no neglect of continuing interest in graduate studies), and it has begun to show undergraduate results.

7. Fields and Interests

The authors argue that there is need for broadening fields and interests, and explicitly urge (Para 25) that new programmes at other universities seek to cover areas not covered

at Toronto. Yet if Toronto, with its enormous faculty, student body, and relatively large library resources, cannot cover a wider range of fields, how is the smaller place to do so? One looks in vain for much practical guidance. The authors are aware that the arguments are strong for studying certain fields elsewhere than in Canada, yet they do not address themselves to the implications of the point. They speak (Para 153) of the "decline" of British History. What do they mean? At Trent, and perhaps elsewhere, there has been a solid expansion here, but it has been outstripped by still greater expansion in other fields.

We would also take exception to the authors' skepticism about historiography. At Trent we are concerned with this in regular courses, in specific 'historiography' courses, and we offer courses on 'theory of history' from an internationally recognized scholar such as W. H. Dray, and a distinguished practitioner, Lionel Rubinoff.

In another connection the authors suggest that they are not very familiar with the Ontario system. Their treatment of ancient history and of contemporary history is perplexing. Do they know that most universities in Ontario do much of the former through Classics departments and the latter through Politics departments? This is the case at Trent. But the authors tend to depend on the statistical evidence of History department faculty (not those of allied departments), of senior faculty, and of full-time faculty. In Trent's case, and this is probably true of others, allied, intermediate rank, and part-time faculty are often as fully committed to research and co-operation in graduate programmes on an occasional basis as their other colleagues. Again, use of statistics is not very helpful.

Specific departmental references concerning fields and interests do not give one the feeling of confidence. McMaster is warmly commended for its demographic work, yet no mention is made of the at least equally significant work in this field by Katz, Winchester, et al at O.I.S.E. and York. The subjectivity and lack of detailed information in this area is perhaps most striking.

8. Co-operation Within the University

At Trent, and without entering into detail, at History's initiative the Canadian Studies Programme has opened up several new courses and research projects in important new fields. A

Nineteenth Century Society sponsored largely by historians focuses entirely upon research papers in Nineteenth Century studies being prepared by historians and other disciplinarians at the university; further, guests such as Professor Maurice Careless and Professor Alexander Brady have added to the value of this Society. Historians also play a prominent role in the preparation of Trent's Journal of Canadian Studies, which invites a wide range of research. The History Department has also sought and warmly welcomed the scholarly and graduate support of Philosophy and Politics.

In the area of inter-university co-operation Trent has been interested and active in co-operation with Queen's. The authors urge more inter-university co-operation, but they are not of much help in proposing mechanisms to bring it about. Emphasis on the Robarts Library is useful, but they have not looked closely at the difficulties, as well as the advantages, of the Interlibrary Loan system.

9. General

Although we cannot always agree with the reasons given for some of the general recommendations, we would give support to Nos. 1, 2, 5, and 9-17 inclusive. We would give more qualified support to Nos. 3, 4, 6, 7, and 8. Our reasons are implicit in the foregoing remarks.

The criteria for supporting these (and other) recommendations would seem to us to need much more examination and discussion among departments. Further, because there is so little indication of mechanisms, we attach great importance to their definition, development, and implementation. The Consultants' Report will probably make a useful contribution to what must still remain a challenging enquiry by the History Discipline Group itself. We hope that the Discipline Group will be invited to meet regularly as a means of co-ordinating efforts among the various Departments of History of Ontario.

May 2, 1974.

Response of the University of Waterloo to the Report of the History Consultants to the Advisory Committee on Academic Planning submitted to ACAP, May 6th, 1974

It is clear from this report that in the opinion of the consultants the state of graduate work in history in the Province of Ontario is quite healthy. A careful reading of the report indicates that the assessment of quality in the graduate programmes in the province is there although it could perhaps have been stated more concisely. The report could also have been more specific in some of its criticisms but nevertheless, the overall assessment of history in the province is reassuring.

Specific Comments:

We find the comments which relate directly to the programme at the University of Waterloo quite favorable (for example paragraphs 116 and 140). Our Ph.D. programme was favorably appraised by OCGS but the small number of students which were subsequently enrolled in the programme were not eligible to receive funding because of the imposition of the embargo. It is gratifying to find this assessment upholding the earlier judgment that the doctoral programme is one of high quality and we welcome the recommendation that it be approved for funding.

We note the consultants' comment with regard to the existence of broken serial runs in the library holdings. Completion of these runs will be an item of the highest priority in library spending in history over the next few years. We expect to be able to significantly improve the situation.

Comments on Recommendations:

The consultants conclude their report with a number of recommendations. We are in general agreement with all of these.

Respectfully submitted,

L. A. K. Watt

L. A. K. Watt
Dean of Graduate Studies

Response of the University of Western Ontario to the Report of the Consultants in History of the Advisory Committee on Academic Planning.

April 30, 1974.

The response of this University to the ACAP Consultants' Report on History has been formulated by a special Senate Committee established for that purpose.

The Committee finds some difficulty in responding to the Consultants' report in that it is somewhat too general and lacking in specific assessments and/or recommendations concerning the individual universities in the Province of Ontario. However, we would like to offer the following comments on the general recommendations to be found on pp.A-73 et seq. of the Report.

Recommendations and Comments

Recommendation 1:

This Recommendation seems to us to be too broad and sweeping. Despite the expansionist tone of the Report in general, we feel that some critical assessment of the number and quality of existing programs would have been in order. The Committee questioned whether all nine Ph.D. programs were necessary to serve the needs of the Province.

Recommendation 3:

We are unhappy with the general tone of this Recommendation. We are opposed to a uniform system of graduate training used in an unvarying way across the province in the manner this Recommendation seems to suggest. Because of the variety of backgrounds possessed by our graduate students, we are in favour of retaining course work, field and comprehensive examinations in order to give more breadth to the training of doctoral candidates and also to serve as a screening device. We also feel that the time of completion for our candidates is satisfactory and we note that this is partially substantiated by the Consultants' remarks about the "remarkable" efforts in the doctoral field at this University. (para. 44, page A-21).

Recommendation 4:

Despite this Recommendation, we favour our present practice of two types of M.A. programs - course and/or dissertation. Again, the varied background of entering candidates and their various prospective academic and professional plans seem to dictate more than one alternative.

Recommendation 5:

We have no part-time Ph.D. program and have no intentions of starting one. While we support the notion of full-time M.A. studies in general, we would like to point out that this Recommendation is contrary to the spirit of the Recommendations of the Report of the Committee on Post-Secondary Education. The part-time M.A. could fill a real social demand and need not be inferior in quality to the full-time program.

Recommendation 6:

The proportion of people involved in graduate work should be left to the discretion of individual departments. At Western many more people, including lecturers, are involved in graduate work than would appear at first glance; they are involved in directing reading courses, examining and giving informal assistance to graduate students.

Recommendation 7:

We remain unconvinced that a need for a significant expansion in enrolment exists. The Consultants' arguments based on exploration of new possibilities of employment (in government, etc.) are untested and would be more persuasive if they were supported by real data.

Recommendation 8:

We have no objection to this when qualified instructors and resources are available. For example, at Western, where we already have good library holdings in the area, we aim to add two Ph.D. students and several M.A. students in Latin American history. We concur with the consultants that the resources exist and that an expansion of British history is desirable (A-46, A-70 para 161 (i)).

Recommendation 9:

We are in full agreement with this Recommendation. Within the last twelve months the History department has hired a specialist in demographic history and the University has provided a grant to catalogue the large regional collection in the library over the next three years. It is expected that a catalogue will be published as a result of this project.

Recommendation 10:

We agree with the spirit of the Recommendation but such activity should, of course, be a matter of individual choice. At Western, we already have an annual program of seminars underway in American, Canadian and Eighteenth Century history which brings in distinguished lecturers from outside the University.

Recommendation 11:

We already work closely with other departments. For example, the French and Philosophy departments have collaborated on a course in Jansenism. A joint program at the undergraduate and graduate levels is also in operation involving the History Department and the Department of History of Science and Medicine. Co-operative arrangements also exist between the History Department and the Departments of Economics and Geography. It should be pointed out that the Examining Boards for our doctoral candidates must include one person from a related department within the University.

Recommendation 14:

We agree with the spirit of this Recommendation but this is essentially a matter for OCGS, COU and the Ministry to consider. The reduction of Teaching Assistantships, however, would create problems for departments. Unless considerable additional funds were allocated, both undergraduate and graduate teaching would suffer from the inevitable increase in teaching loads. Also, useful training would be lost to a majority of graduate students contemplating a teaching career.

Recommendation 16 and 17:

We strongly support both these Recommendations.

Finally, we should like to note the reference to Asian Studies (A-51, para. 112) is, at least, premature. An examination of the possibility of launching a program in Asian Studies has been undertaken by the University but final decisions remain to be taken. We would also protest the footnote reference about a "small-scale" program p. A-66. It can be seen in the Appendix that in 1972-73 there were 25 members in the graduate faculty, 42 master's candidates, 15 Ph.D. candidates and 23 degrees granted. We feel these data do not warrant the description applied.

The Director: Graduate Studies and Research

Wilfrid Laurier University *Waterloo, Ontario, Canada N2L 3C5. Telephone (519) 884 1970*

May 3, 1974

Dr. M. A. Preston
Executive Vice-Chairman
Council of Ontario Universities
Advisory Committee on Academic Planning
Ontario Council on Graduate Studies
130 St. George Street, Suite 8039
Toronto, Ontario
M5S 2T4

Dear Dr. Preston:

Wilfrid Laurier University is impressed with the thoroughness of the Consultants' Report on Graduate Work in History in Ontario.

The support given smaller programs is most welcome. We believe that opportunity for graduate work may well be granted by a smaller institution, especially to students who can proceed only on a part-time basis. In this connection we would, however, question the strong stand taken by the consultants that the thesis stream is an exclusive route to a degree. While a thesis is a most desirable exercise, especially for students planning to do advanced work here or elsewhere, we question whether it ought to be required without exception. Many candidates, for example those engaged in high school teaching, will often be interested in a terminal M.A. degree. It can be argued that such students may benefit as well from four courses as they would from a thesis.

In general, we are prepared to lend our support to the report and would commend those concerned with its research and compilation.

Cordially yours

Dr. N.E. Wagner, Director
Graduate Studies & Research

NEW:as
c.c. Dr. N. Tayler, Vice-President - Academic
Dr. J. Harkins, History Department

THE UNIVERSITY OF WINDSOR RESPONSE

to the

A.C.A.P. REPORT ON HISTORY

The Consultants' Report on History is an informative one, as it should be, and civilized in tone as one would expect. It is also a somewhat bland report cautiously supporting all present programs. This cautious quality is summed up by a Words of Warning section (A- 74) where the Consultants warn against "prevalent conservatism" and urge "some dynamic advances", and then, as though unnerved by the possibilities implied, immediately add the careful warning: "New forms of History...must be introduced with judicious care."

The conservative tone of the document is illustrated by the summary of recommendations, most of which, like motherhood, can be easily supported. Some of them, however, reveal a curious insensibility to contemporary social needs and developments such as their reservation about part-time M.A.'s, and the M.A. by course work. (A- 73 ; 4-5)

In regard to the support of Masters students at Windsor, the department has now instituted a teaching assistantship program, and the Administration has approved a supportive budget. It is to be hoped that the Scholarships recently established for the Graduate School will prove helpful to the better students in the History Department.

In paragraphs 78 to 83 inclusive, pp. A- 35 ff, the Consultants analyze the areas of study for dissertation work and found Windsor concentrating on what is essentially history since the eighteenth century.

This concentration in the substantially nineteenth and twentieth centuries is deliberate in the context of the department's life-span to date, as is the concentration of Library resources within that orientation. We are encouraged by the findings and analysis of the Consultants themselves that our Library holdings (cf. para. 123 and 124 especially; pp. A-[illegible] f.) are vindicated by the satisfactory state of our Library collections based on our purchase policy over the years.

Under the present circumstances the department is virtually forced to remain in its present areas of concentration but there is potential for some expansion into other areas. We take issue with the Consultants' statement that "Windsor needs to look to the time-span; a Department confined absolutely to Modern History is very lop-sided") para. 83, p. A-36). We are aware of the limitations in our time-span but we do not agree to the proposition that our Department is confined absolutely to Modern History. The Consultants themselves recognized that "Eastern Europe received attention at Windsor (1500-1945)", (para. 81, p. A-35).

We feel that it would be fairer to describe the Windsor operation not so much in the context of its objectively imposed time-span limitations but rather in the context of how well such operation is working out and how well it is supported by its Library resources. The Consultants' own reporting and impressions about the Library actually supports the present operation.

We wish to add in closing that the Department of History in Windsor since this A.C.A.P. exercise began some one and a half years ago, found that in some other areas of the University graduate work is carried out with historical orientation. For

example, the graduate students in the Faculty of Physical Education are investigating certain sports activities in an historical setting with the result that much of the product thus derived is substantially within the realm of social history. The History department co-operates with that Faculty with its staff serving as external examiners on several projects. The Department is anticipating further co-operation by making it a two-way direction.

Similarly, there are trained historians on the staff of other Departments, as for example in the Department of Asian Studies and the Department of Classics, and the Department of History intends to utilize such additional talents in its own graduate operation as student needs develop the demand.

In the section The Future of Graduate Programs, (para. 151, p. A-66) it is stated, i.a. that Windsor does not yet command resources for a Ph.D. program. This conclusion seems somewhat extreme in view of the Consultants' good rating of University of Windsor library holdings. The Consultants also have overlooked -- in making reference to our utilization of Detroit facilities (p. A-54) -- the excellent facilities of the University of Michigan and Michigan State, which are not in Detroit, though Wayne State (not mentioned) is.

The Department also feels that its strength in non-Canadian fields did not receive justice. It is particularly proud of its holdings in Maritime history, in which there exists some faculty expertise. We wish, thus, to correct the impression in the statement on p. A-67 , last sentence of para. 153.

YORK UNIVERSITY
4700 KEELE STREET,
DOWNSVIEW, ONTARIO, CANADA

FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES
OFFICE OF THE DEAN

22 May 1974.

Professor M.A. Preston,
Executive Vice-Chairman, ACAP,
Council of Ontario Universities,
130 St. George Street, Suite 8039,
Toronto, Ontario.

Dear Professor Preston,

This letter represents the York University response to the ACAP History Consultants' Report.

The report makes interesting reading. We are impressed by the consultants' lively presentation and by their positive and idealistic commitment to their discipline. But their idealism, we would suggest, reveals some lack of understanding of the Ontario situation. We admire the conscientiousness with which documentation has been collated, but find it regrettable and frustrating that little attempt has been made to make value judgements on the existing programmes in the Province. As far as York is concerned, our gratification regarding the way in which our programme is referred to as one of the "giants" is counterbalanced by the scattered adverse criticisms. But just as the various programmes are not ranked by the consultants, so they are not individually assessed. Thus, we find it difficult to identify any integrated set of recommendations which might help us in the development of our programme. What follows consists of responses to the comments or judgements made about various features of our programme.

A. (P.A-8) The expansion of History at York, we are told, "may be regarded as exceptional, peculiar, and possibly disquieting". This suggestion at once bewilders and intrigues us. Either the consultants are employing some idiosyncratic and unstated criterion of normal growth, or they have access to information which is unknown to us. We would be the last to deny our entitlement to our fair share of drama; so it is with some regret that we must assert that the development of History here has followed lines which are predictable, understandable, and conventional to the point of mundanity.

B. (P.A-14 , paragraph 28) Understandably, our reaction to this paragraph is mixed. We accept that our faculty includes many members not currently engaged in graduate teaching, a point which will be mentioned later in this response, and of course are gratified by the compliment expressed in the final sentence.

Professor M.A. Preston 22 May 1974

C. (P. A-17) The censure of ourselves and the University of Western Ontario in paragraph 33 (that we "seem disinclined to make full use of /our/ varied resources. We would urge such Departments to remember that the pursuit of traditional studies and functions above all requires constant freshness to remain alive . . .") does not seem to us to make a good fit with the conclusion of paragraph 28 mentioned on page one - that our figures demonstrate that the system "has proved itself capable of developing in novel ways".

D. (P. A-21, paragraph 43) Here, as elsewhere in the report, the criticism is made that York has insufficient graduate students in History to justify its large faculty. It is true that our graduate programme in History has been relatively small, with an annual new intake of approximately 15 M.A. and 6 Ph.D. students (although it seems likely that about 25 M.A. students will be admitted this coming year). However, we would point out that these figures were made clear in our original Appraisals submission in 1968, and in the Programme Director's comment to ACAP on 12 March 1973. Furthermore, our admission level is a direct reflection of the quality of applicants to the programme. We are reluctant to fill the programme with our own graduates, but are currently making offers of admission to all external applicants in fields where we have some competence, given that they have academic records implying at least a B+ level. We would like to make it clear that we are not opposed to growth, nor have we ever been. But we stand firmly on the principle that an increase in enrolment should not be gained at the expense of quality.

As an indication of our readiness to introduce new opportunities in graduate study, we cite two new developments: (i) the introduction of an M.A. option for part-time study by teachers aimed at adapting historiography to the special needs of classroom professionals, and (ii) the acceptance of part-time students into the regular M.A. programme.

Currently our aim is to provide optimal educational opportunities for the relatively small number of appropriately qualified students who come to us. With the growth of our reputation - admittedly still slower on our home ground than elsewhere - and the anticipated increase in qualified applicants, we shall undoubtedly see larger growth in our History programme. Currently, it is true, not all our faculty members in History have been admitted to membership of the Faculty of Graduate Studies. But we fully expect junior faculty to participate in graduate work as they mature as scholars, and as the three undergraduate history departments become able to allocate a greater share of their teaching time. There already exists some rotation of course responsibilities. Junior faculty members participate in graduate education much more than our course listings would indicate. Junior faculty act as advisers on research papers, as examiners on qualifying examinations, and as members of dissertation committees.

Professor M.A. Preston

22 May 1974

E. (P. A-35, paragraph 82) With the comments of the consultants on historiography, as taught in introductory courses, we essentially agreed. In reviewing our own approach we decided to eliminate the compulsory colloquium in what the consultants call "this mildly trendy subject". We did so before the consultants' report reached us.

F. (P. A-44, paragraph 96) We share some of the consultants' concern regarding pre-dissertation requirements; we have few such requirements. Nevertheless, we believe that some additional work in this field is necessary before the Ph.D. student embarks upon his/her dissertation.

G. (P. A-49 , paragraph 104) We of course endorse the consultants' view of the value of relationships between History programmes and are always ready to co-operate on projects and joint ventures. Indeed, we could list a number of individual collaborative endeavours, of which the consultants were presumably unaware. On the other hand, what struck us as strange was that the York complaints about the trivial problems involved in driving through the 15 miles of city traffic to the University of Toronto struck the consultants as strange. The standing record for the journey (15 miles but this only at certain times of day) is held by the Dean of Graduate Studies who once covered the distance in 29 minutes flat, at 2 o'clock on a clear morning. The consolation prize was awarded also to the Dean of Graduate Studies for covering the route one late winter afternoon in one hour, thirty-seven minutes including parking.

H. (Pp. A-60-61 paragraph 137 We are surprised and distressed by the assertion that the "main part of the faculty, whether engaged in graduate work or not, felt that the calls of the undergraduate programme, work for other Departments (at the same level), and the national job situation inhibited any expansion, however small". Such a view is not held by this University as such, nor, to the best of our knowledge, by the "main part" of the faculty members in History. We have every sympathy with the sentiments expressed in paragraph 137, and we cannot believe that more than a few individual members of faculty would take the opposition view ascribed to them by the consultants.

I. (P. A-73, recommendation no. 4) As would be anticipated from any reading of the above, our reaction to this specific recommendation is that it savours of exhorting us to desist from beating our wives.

FESTINA LENTE.

Yours sincerely,

Graham Reed

GR/dm

Dr. Graham Reed,
Dean, Faculty of
Graduate Studies.

APPENDIX D

PROCEDURE OF PLANNING STUDY AND TERMS OF REFERENCE

Procedure for History Planning Assessment

February 15, 1973

A. Tasks Requested from Discipline Group (with help available from ACAP at all stages)

A.1 The "major divisions" of study for purposes of collecting data will be recommended by the discipline group: The method of dealing with borderline fields will be recommended by the discipline group.

A.2 Suggest suitable consultants. This also will be a matter for discussion with ACAP.

A.3 Develop and recommend procedures for the planning assessment, including comment on pro formae to be used for the gathering of information on current, past and future programmes as described in paragraph B.1.

A.4 Examine and comment on the adequacy of the data reported by the universities.

A.5 Both in consultation with ACAP and separately, consider the situation revealed by the statements concerning proposed future programmes and consider whether future plans should be modified or developed in more detail. As a result of this step, individual universities may wish to revise the material described in B.1.d below.

A.6 Possibly develop a tentative plan for development of established or new graduate work in history in Ontario. Any such plans will be reported to ACAP which will transmit them to the consultants.

A.7 Meets with the consultants, at least twice, once before they begin site visits and again to discuss their draft report.

B. Information from Universities

B.1 Each university is asked to supply ACAP, in the form indicated by ACAP after comment by the discipline group (paragraph A.3) information as follows:

(a) for each major division (Appendix A)

(i) current list of faculty members showing fraction of research and graduate instruction time devoted to the division (for part-time professors show the time spent on university duties); (Form 1)

(b) for each "department"

(i) Curricula Vitarum of all faculty members in history (Assistant Professors and higher) showing whether or not they are now engaged in graduate work and showing inter alia complete publication lists, research funding in the past five years, and students and post-doctoral fellows supervised during their careers; (Form 2)

(ii) numbers of full-time and part-time faculty members for each of the past five years; (Form 3)

(iii) numbers of full-time and part-time Master's and Ph.D. students for each of the past five years; (Form 3)

(iv) resources of space--a statement indicating the department's view of the adequacy of its space, and, in connection with the future plans in (d) below, discussing future space provision; (Written statement)

(v) undergraduate base; honours students, number of qualifying or make-up year students, course enrolment, etc.; (Form 4)

(vi) other general items relevant to research and graduate study, e.g. computing facilities; (Written statement)

(vii) support from related departments including shared teaching and research, state cross-appointments; (Written statement)

(viii) extent of major laboratory facilities and equipment available; (Written statement)

(ix) library resources: analysis of holdings and budget; (Separate questionnaire)

(x) description of any inter-university arrangements for graduate work; (Written statement)

(xi) a description of the present graduate programme (Written statement)

(c) table of characteristics of graduate students in the department in previous five years, separately for Master's and Ph.D.'s, breaking down numbers by:

(i) F.T. and P.T.; (Form 5)

(ii) immigration status (4 years), and country of first degree; (Form 5)

(iii) sources of financial support; (Form 6)

(iv) time to reach degree; 193 (Under review)

(v) drop-out number; (Form 5)

(vi) failures; (Form 5)

(vii) Ph.D. ABDs; (Form 3)

(viii) degrees granted; (Form 5)

(ix) post-graduate employment of Ph.D.'s and ABD's (a) immediate and (b) after two years. (Form 7)

(d) proposed plans for the future, in as much detail as the department can provide, including the proposed scheme for support of these plans, and accompanied by supporting arguments, including consideration of the sources of graduate students and an analysis of demand for graduates from the programmes. The various headings in (a) and (b) above should be dealt with quantitatively where possible; as a minimum, planned numbers of faculty and graduate students should be given for the next five years.

B.2 The material so supplied will be collated by ACAP and transmitted to the discipline group for action indicated by paragraphs A.4, A.5 and A.6.

B.3 Apart from the material described in B.1.d and to some extent generated at the department level, each interested university will be requested to make an individual statement on its plans for the development of history, in particular the items of future commitment implied by item B.1.d. Deadline dates for parts A and B will be established by ACAP.

C. Terms of Reference of Consultants

C.1 Consider the materials prepared by the discipline group and the universities and obtain other data they may require to carry out the tasks detailed below. They may obtain data and views from any relevant source, such as; employers of holders of graduate degrees, professional and learned societies, federal agencies. The campus of each interested university shall be visited by at least two consultants. Consultants shall arrange their schedule of visits to the universities in consultation with ACAP to ensure uniformity. Reports of appraisal consultants are privileged documents and are not to be made available to ACAP consultants. Consultants shall liaise with the discipline group near the beginning of the work, during the work as they consider necessary, and immediately before preparing their final report.

C.2 Report on the adequacy of the present state of graduate work in history in the province in general and in each university where applicable, discussing the following:

a. faculty qualifications and numbers;

b. nature and range of programmes offered (courses and fields);

c. enrolment size and distribution amongst universities;

d. quality of student body; admission requirements;

e. relationship to related disciplines;

f. physical facilities (library, archival, etc.);

g. financial support of students;

h. other matters considered by the consultants to be significant.

C.3 Make recommendations for the development of graduate work in history in Ontario between 1973 and 1983, but in more detail for 1973 through 1978, and, without limiting the generality of the foregoing, dealing with the following points which would:

a. indicate the desirable scale of graduate work in history in Ontario on the basis of foreseeable need, considering the possibility that new fields should be emphasized, and indicate whether these considerations lead to the desirability of modifying or discontinuing some existing programmes or inaugurating new programmes or new kinds of programmes;

b. comment on the appropriateness of part-time programmes;

c. taking account of relative quality and other factors, indicate a suitable distribution amongst the universities of responsibility for programmes and for specialities where appropriate, including consideration of the need for any increase or decrease in the number of departments offering doctoral work and including consideration of areas of collaboration and sharing of facilities at regional level and across the province;

d. indicate the distribution of enrolment amongst the universities, showing desirable ranges of enrolment, yearly for five years where growth or decline is recommended;

e. indicate the desirable extent of involvement with related disciplines, identifying any suggested areas for great collaboration.

In all cases, it is important that the rationale for the recommendations be clear; this is especially important for items c. and d. Consultants are asked to comment on advantages and disadvantages of various techniques for arranging that their recommendations become effective.

C.4 It is permissable for consultants to recommend appraisals of individual programmes. This would arise if consultants were to suspect that a programme would be found to be wholly or in part below minimum acceptable standards; an appraisal by the Appraisals Committee is the means of

settling the question. It is recognized that this actior would be infrequent. Perhaps more likely, in planning assessments in some disciplines, consultants may find an excess of programmes in the same area of study, all of which could pass an appraisal; they would then have to make their own judgments of relative quality (a task outside the terms of reference of the Appraisals Committee), and guided by this judgment and other factors, the ACAP consultants would have to recommend where enrolment should be curtailed or eliminated.

D. Appointment of Consultants

The consultants shall include one person of wide academic experience in Canada, but in a different discipline.

E. Report of Consultants

The consultants submit a joint report to ACAP. Minority reports are, of course, possible. The reasoning leading to their recommendations should be given fully, in view of the subsequent treatment of the report. The report is submitted for comment to the discipline group and to each interested university. There may be informal or interim exchanges of views amongst the discipline group, the universities, and ACAP. Any university which wishes to make a formal statement on the consultants' report shall submit it to ACAP. Any such report shall be transmitted to the discipline group. The discipline group shall submit its formal comments and/or recommendations to ACAP. ACAP considers the discipline group and university statements along with the consultants' report and transmits them to COU with its recommendations of the position COU should adopt. Copies of the material transmitted to COU will be supplied to OCGS, to the Council of Deans of Arts and Science, and to the members of the discipline group and to the interested universities. The consultants' report may be published together with the comments of the discipline group, those of any university so requesting, and with the position adopted by COU.

HISTORY DISCIPLINE ASSESSMENT

Divisional Breakdown

Region	Topic	Period
Canadian	Intellectual	Ancient (to 400 A.D.)
American	Social	Medieval (400-1450)
British (+Imperial)	Economic	Early Modern (1450-1700)
West European	Religious	Modern (1700-1945)
East European	Urban	Contemporary (1945 to now)
Asian	Political	
African	Diplomatic	
Latin American	Cultural	
	Military	
	Historiography	
	Local	
	History of Science	

A P P E N D I X E

DISCIPLINE GROUP MEMBERSHIP

DISCIPLINE GROUP MEMBERSHIP

BROCK -	Dr. F.C. Drake
CARLETON -	Professor S.R. Mealing until September 1972 Professor H.B. Neatby
GUELPH -	Professor D.C. Masters until March 1974 Professor A.M. Evans
LAKEHEAD -	Professor M.E. Arthur
LAURENTIAN -	Dr. G.A. Stelter until August 1972 Dr. J.L. Black
McMASTER	Professor G.S. French until September 1972 Professor H.W. McCready
OTTAWA -	Professor C.J. Jaenen until September 1972 Dr. J. Monet
QUEEN's -	Professor J.A. Leith until November 1972 Professor G.A. Rawlyk until August 1973 Professor W.R. Graham
TORONTO -	Professor A.P. Thornton until June 1972 *Professor J.B. Conacher
TRENT -	Professor A. Wilson
WATERLOO -	Professor J.F. New
WESTERN ONTARIO -	Dr. C.A. Ruud until May 1974 Dr. J.N. Thompson
WILFRID LAURIER -	Dr. J. Harkins
WINDSOR -	Dr. B. Miner until September 1972 Professor M.N. Vuckovic
YORK -	Professor G.R. Cook until May 1973 Professor J.T. Saywell

* chairman of discipline group

APPENDIX F

ROLES OF ACAP AND OF DISCIPLINE GROUPS

Ontario Council on Graduate Studies

By-Law No. 3

A By-Law to establish a Committee on the Academic Planning of Graduate Studies.

1. The Ontario Council on Graduate Studies, recognizing the importance of providing for the continued and orderly development of graduate studies in the Ontario universities, establishes a Standing Committee to be known as the Advisory Committee on Academic Planning (abbreviation - ACAP).

Interpretation

2. In this By-Law,

(a) "Committee" without further specification, means the Advisory Committee on Academic Planning;

(b) "Council" or OCGS means the Ontario Council on Graduate Studies;

(c) "Committee of Presidents" or CPUO means the Committee of Presidents of Universities of Ontario;

(d) "university" means a provincially assisted university in Ontario;

(e) "discipline" means any branch or combination of branches of learning so designated;

(f) "discipline group" means a body designated as such by the Committee of Presidents of the Universities of Ontario, and normally consisting, for any one discipline, of one representative from each of the interested universities;

(g) "planning assessment" means a formal review of current and projected graduate programmes within a discipline or a group of disciplines;

(h) "programme" signifies all aspects of a particular graduate undertaking;

(i) "rationalization" means the arranging of graduate programmes in order to avoid undesirable duplication, eliminate waste, and enhance and sustain quality.

Membership

3. (a) The Committee shall consist of at least seven members of the professoriate in Ontario universities, some of whom shall be members of the Council.

(b) The members of the Committee shall serve for such periods of time as the Council may determine, and they shall be selected in such manner as may provide for reasonable balance both of academic disciplines and of universities.

(c) The members of the Committee shall be appointed as individuals.

Chairman

4. The Chairman of the Committee shall be named by the Council, and he shall have one vote.

Quorum

5. A majority of all members of the Committee shall constitute a quorum.

Functions

6. The functions of the committee shall be

(a) To advise OCGS on steps to be taken to implement effective provincial planning of graduate development;

(b) To promote the rationalization of graduate studies within the universities, in cooperation with the discipline groups;

(c) To recommend, through OCGS, to CPUO the carrying out of planning assessments of disciplines or groups of disciplines and to recommend suitable arrangements and procedures for each assessment;

(d) To supervise the conduct of each planning assessment approved by CPUO;

(e) To respond to requests by CPUO to have a discipline assessment conducted by proposing suitable arrangements;

(f) to submit to CPUO the reports of the assessments together with any recommendations which the committee wishes to make. A copy of the report shall be sent to Council.

Jurisdiction

7. In order that the Committee may discharge the functions described in Section 6 above, it shall be authorized

(a) to request a university to provide such information pertaining to graduate studies as may enable the Committee to discharge its functions;

(b) to request a discipline group to provide such information as may enable the Committee to discharge its functions;

(c) to receive reports from the universities and from the discipline groups, and to comment and communicate with the universities and the discipline groups concerning such reports;

(d) to convene a meeting of any discipline group for the purpose of discussing the development to date, and proposals for the future development of graduate studies in the discipline concerned;

(e) to send one or more representatives to a meeting of a discipline group at the invitation of the discipline group;

(f) to make such suggestions to a discipline group as may be deemed appropriate to the functions of the Committee;

(g) to supervise the conduct of planning assessments, and to report thereon to the Committee of Presidents of Universities of Ontario;

(h) generally to report and to make recommendations to the Council;

(i) to seek and receive advice from appropriate experts;

(j) to employ consultants in connection with planning assessments.

Procedures

8. The procedure to be followed by the Committee shall be as approved by the Committee of Presidents of the University of Ontario.

9. The Committee's function is solely advisory.

Effective Date

10. This By-Law shall take effect January 1971.

ACAP DISCIPLINE GROUPS AND THEIR ROLES

1. Establishment of a Group

a. When it is considered desirable to activate planning of graduate work in some discipline(s) or interdisciplinary area, COU, on the advice of OCGS, will authorize the establishment of an ACAP discipline group, if it was not already approved and included in the May, 1968 list. If it is already authorized, ACAP may decide to set it up as described in paragraph b.

b. The Executive Vice-Chairman of ACAP will then invite the executive head of each university (including Waterloo Lutheran University) either to nominate a member of the discipline group or to indicate that his university has no plans for graduate study in this discipline in the next five years or so. If a university can state no plans for future graduate work in the subject, but feels that a watching brief is desirable, it may appoint an observer to the group.

c. Changes of a university's representative are to be notified by the executive head.

d. The group shall select its own chairman.

2. Meetings

a. A discipline group may meet at the call of its chairman or in accord with its own arrangements.

b. A discipline group may be called to meet by the Executive Vice-Chairman acting for ACAP.

3. Responsibilities

a. The group is to keep under review the plans for graduate work in its discipline in Ontario, including new developments and trends in the discipline, and to make reports to ACAP on a regular basis.

b. The group may make recommendations to ACAP in connection with graduate work in its discipline when it considers it appropriate.

c. ACAP will assist the group in obtaining information and data, as mutually agreed.

d. When COU has instructed ACAP to conduct a planning assessment, the discipline group will assist and advise ACAP in determining procedures and terms of reference, will report as requested and will generally facilitate the assessment.

Approved by OCGS March 22, 1973
and by COU April 6, 1973.

A P P E N D I X G

CURRICULA VITARUM OF THE CONSULTANTS

GEOFFREY R. ELTON

Born Tubingen, Germany, August 17, 1921

BA, University of London, 1943
PhD, University of London, 1948
LitD, University of Cambridge, 1960

University of Glasgow, Assistant in History, 1948-9
University of Cambridge, 1949-
Assistant Lecturer, 1949-53
Lecturer, 1953-63
Reader in Tudor Studies, 1963-67
Fellow of Clare College, 1954-
Professor of English Constitutional History, 1967-
University of Pittsburgh, Visiting Professor, 1963
University of Colorado, Visiting Professor, 1967

Fellow of the British Academy, 1967-
Fellow of the Royal Historical Scoeity, 1954-
President, 1973-77

Publications:

England Under the Tudors, 1955
Tudor Constitution, 1960
Tudor Revolution in Government, 1963
Reformation Europe, 1963
Practice of History, 1967
Political History, 1970
Policy and Police, 1972
Reform and Renewal, 1973

Address: Clare College
Cambridge, England. CB2 1TL.

Jean Hamelin

Né à Saint-Narcisse, Québec, Canada, 13 juillet 1931.

BA, Université Laval, 1952
Licence ès lettres (histoire), Université Laval, 1954
Dipl. de l'Ecole Pratique des Hautres Etudes, Paris, 1957

Université Laval, 1957-

Professeur-assistant, 1957-1959
Professeur-auxiliaire, 59 -
Professeur-agrégé,
Professeur ,

Vice-doyen de la Faculté des Lettres, 1969-1971

Directeur du département d'histoire, 1971 - 1974

Directeur-adjoint du Dictionnaire Biographique du Canada, 1973+

Elu membre de la Société Royale du Canada, 1972

Récipiendaire de la médaille Tyrrell, 1972

Prix Littéraire du Gouverneur-Général, 1972

Publications:

Economie et Société en Nouvelle-France, 1960
Les Journaux du Québec, 1965
Guide d'Histoire du Canada, 1969
Histoire économique du Québec, 1971

Adresse:

Département d'Histoire
Cité Universitaire Laval, Québec, Canada GIK 7P4.

HENRY KREISEL

Born Vienna, Austria, June 5, 1922

BA, University of Toronto, 1946
MA, University of Toronto, 1947
PhD, University of London, 1954

University of Alberta, 1947-
- Lecturer in English, 1947-50
- Assistant Professor, 1950-55
- Associate Professor, 1955-59
- Professor, 1959-
- Head of Department of English, 1961-67
- Senior Associate Dean of Faculty of Graduate Studies, 1967-69
- Acting Dean of Faculty of Graduate Studies, 1969-70
- Vice-President (Academic), 1970-

University of British Columbia, Visiting Professor, 1951

Reuben Wells Leonard Fellowship, 1947
Travelling Fellowship of Royal Society of Canada, 1953
The President's Medal, University of Western Ontario, 1960

Advisory Committee on Fine Arts, Department of Transport, 1959
Alberta Teachers' Association English Council, 1962-66
Canada Council Post-Graduate Scholarship Committee, English Panel Chairman, 1963-65
Governor-General's Awards Jury for Literature, 1966-69
University of Alberta, Board of Governors, 1966-69
Edmonton Art Gallery, Vice-President, 1969-70

Association of Canadian University Teachers of English, President, 1962-63
Humanities Association of Canada, Executive Member, 1964-66
Elected Fellow of the Royal Society of Arts, 1970
Elected Fellow of the International Institute of Arts and Letters, 1961

Author: The Rich Man (Novel), 1948
The Betrayal (Novel), 1964
Other writings include short stores in many journals and reprinted in
- The Best American Short Stories, 1966
- A Book of Canadian Stories, 1962
- Modern Canadian Stories, 1967

Address:
University of Alberta
Edmonton, Alberta. T6G 2J9.

APPENDIX H

ADDENDUM TO CONSULTANTS' REPORT

ADDENDUM TO CONSULTANTS' REPORT ON GRADUATE STUDIES IN THE HISTORY DEPARTMENTS OF THE UNIVERSITIES OF ONTARIO

The History consultants have been asked to submit an addendum to the main report, since the ACAP committee--in view of the facts that the Province already has seven Ph.D. programs in operation and the total number of Ph.D. students is unlikely to increase in the near future--wanted a more strongly argued case why the two unfunded Ph.D. programs at Carleton and Waterloo should now be funded. The argument is put forward that an increase in the number of programs implies a decrease in enrolment elsewhere. We are not entirely convinced that that is so. It could also be that a student who wanted to do a Ph.D. with a professor at, say, Carleton would not in fact go elsewhere to study, but might abandon plans for a degree altogether.

We did not make our recommendation for the funding of nine Ph.D. programs lightly (see para. 86, 101, 102). We were aware of the implications of this recommendation. If we had taken a strict economic point of view, we might easily have come to the conclusion that all the Ph.D. work in Ontario could be done by three or at most four universities. That becomes clear from an examination of Table XII (Ph.D. Students in History), p. 137 of the Report.

In 1972-3 there were 226 full-time Ph.D. students in Ontario. Of these, 117 were at Toronto, 39 at Queen's, and 21 at York. These three universities together thus accounted for 78.3% of all Ph.D. students. (Toronto alone had 51.8%). If one adds the University of Ottawa, because of its special bilingual and Francophone character, the total becomes 190 or 84.1% of the total.

The situation remains virtually unchanged if one considers the total of both full-time and part-time Ph.D. students in 1972-3. Of 338 students, 284 or 84% of the total were at the four universities mentioned above.

It would be easy to say that the remaining 54 students should be distributed among these four universities. But even if this were practicable, it would hardly be a wise course of action, since it would be bad both for the health of the university system in the Province and for the discipline itself.

We were keenly aware that the University of Toronto completely dominated graduate work in History. If York is added, the City of Toronto contains about 60% of all the Ph.D. students in History. We did not think that a lopsidedly Toronto-based history graduate program is really desirable, but we recognized the realities. Because of the resources available in Toronto, both in terms of staff and libraries, the city acts like a magnet. But precisely for this reason it is necessary to provide a counterbalance (see our comments in para. 41 and 42).

The Funding of the Programs at Carleton and Waterloo

a) Carleton

As we point out in para. 141, Carleton has this year admitted its first Ph.D. students, though the University has not yet had approval for the funding of the program. The program has been started after the most thorough and painstaking of preparations. "Indeed," we say in para. 141, "our only criticism would touch upon the undue delay in bringing the program into being and the reluctance to start on a bigger scale, offering more areas of study. The teaching faculty includes several excellent scholars, able and willing to direct advanced research, and in particular able to contribute novel and special approaches in socio-economic history, not found elsewhere in the Province, to the study of Canadian history." We note here that the Department agreed on November 4, 1968, that "with twenty-one members in the Department, eight should be added before attempting a Ph.D. program." They certainly proceeded with all due caution! (See para. 3[illegible].) Only when they were satisfied that the expansion of library holdings as well as staff had satisfied the conditions they had set for themselves did they move to institute the program. They will concentrate almost wholly on Canadian history, and the Ph.D. program will stress social and intellectual rather than political and constitutional history. The latter is of course very well established both in Toronto and Queen's, and Carleton will rightly

place emphasis elsewhere, thougn political and diplomatic history will not be excluded.

In Professors Mealing, Neatby, Oellet, and Wise, Carleton has an exceptionally strong group of specialists in Canadian history, and there are several younger men who might be expected to take part in the program in the not too distant future.

It became clear also in interviews we had with students at Carleton that many of them came to the University to do their M.A. because of their interest in social and intellectual history, and several of them want to continue their work at Carleton. The pressure to begin the Ph.D. program has thus come as much from students as from members of the staff. Indeed, there continues to be a very strong demand from students for entrance to the graduate program.

Carleton has a large, and generally well-balanced Department of 38 full-time members, so that students taking graduate courses or preparing for their fields will have ample opportunity for instruction and consultation. In terms of full-time faculty, Carleton ranks third in the Province, just ahead of Western and Waterloo, and far ahead of McMaster and Guelph.

The one surprising thing, as we point out in para. 23, is that Carleton does rather badly by American history, considering their total teaching strength.

We need not stress again that the proximity of the National Archives is a major factor, and "that Carleton can and

should provide an English-speaking balance to the predominantly Francophone orientation of Ottawa[1]" and that "once both institutions offer the Ph.D., the opportunity exists for immensely fruitful cooperative and complimentary enterprises." (See para. 141.)

b) Waterloo

Like the Ph.D. program at Carleton, the program at Waterloo has had the most careful preparation; it was not proposed until it was clear that the program would be soundly based. As we point out in para. 14, the growth of the Department of History at Waterloo during the period 1968 to 1972 has been second only to that of York. During that period, the full-time faculty at Waterloo doubled, from 18 to 32. There is no doubt that the Department made a number of excellent appointments in several areas, and the quality of the members of the staff must now be rated among the best in the Province. We draw attention to para. 141, and want to reiterate that the program at Waterloo struck us in some ways as the most remarkable program of all. The Department is taking some genuinely innovative steps, particularly in the introduction of the so-called "doctoral colloquium", which may provide a genuine alternative to the traditional field examinations. We found in Waterloo "unmistakably the signs of a free-wheeling situation in which new things are burgeoning." (See para. 34.)

[1]We should note, in view of some comments from Ottawa, that we were fully aware that students at Ottawa can do their work in English, but we consider that Ottawa's bilingual and Francophone orientation makes a unique contribution to historical studies in Ontario.

The great strength of the Department lies in two areas: Reformation History, and British Imperial History, with special emphasis on slavery. As we point out in para. 116, the resources available at Waterloo make it possible for the establishment of what may well become a world centre for studies in the so-called Radical Reformation. We commend also the arrangements that have been made with Guelph for co-operation in graduate instruction and research in Reformation History.

Waterloo has some strength also in several areas of modern European history, chiefly French, Russian, and German national history, and in modern European diplomatic and intellectual history, and it has developing strength in some areas of Canadian history. Here a number of younger historians are focussing on topics of local history and on topics related to the history of minority populations that are not dealt with in other departments in Ontario.

To sum up: The Ph.D. programs at Carleton and Waterloo have been carefully prepared, and the departments have the necessary resources to carry them out. They have a fairly large, well-qualified staff. They will be concentrating on areas of history and on approaches to history that will add greatly to what is already available in Ontario. The special contributions they have to make to the study of History should be available to students.

The Established Ph.D. Programs

a) Toronto, York, Queen's, Ottawa

Of the established programs, the ones at Toronto, York, and Queen's offer students the widest choices. Toronto is clearly pre-eminent in the Province, and indeed in Canada. Its very large faculty, among them many historians of international distinction, and its superb library resources assure this pre-eminence. That is not to say that Toronto can do everything, or that there is not a need for other approaches in already established areas of research. Thus the work done in, say, Canadian history in such places as McMaster and Guelph does not simply duplicate work done at Toronto.

Toronto and Queen's, the two well-established and relatively ancient institutions, tend to be conservative in their approach to gradute work. We need not repeat here what we said on that subject in our Report. We are not unaware, however, of the virtues of the Ph.D. programs at Toronto and Queen's.

York, because of a very large, and highly qualified faculty, and the diversity of interests to be found there has extraordinary potential, though we feel that that potential has not yet been fully realized. But York is a powerhouse, second only to Toronto.

Ottawa, because of its bilingual and Francophone character, occupies a special place in Ontario. It has undergone major changes recently (see para. 19, 34). The full impact of these changes is

yet to be felt. The strength of the Department is in the history of French Canada, and in the history of Europe of the ancien régime and its colonies, as well as certain aspects of 19th and early 20th century Europe. The Department is noticeably weak in American history.

In the recruitment of staff the Department has shown special concern to attract professors who are bilingual, and the Department has assumed a special responsibility in seeing to it that both French and English-speaking students become familiar with the results of historical research in "the other tradition".

b) Western, McMaster, Guelph

As we pointed out at the beginning of this addendum, Toronto, Queen's, York, and Ottawa accounted for 84% of all Ph.D. students in 1972-3, McMaster, Western, and Guelph account between them for the other 16%.

McMaster and Guelph have a small full-time faculty--22 and 15 respectively for 1972-3; Western in that year had a full-time faculty of 36, yet had fewer Ph.D. students in that year than McMaster (15 to McMaster's 23), and only one more student than Guelph.

Although Western has strength in both American and European history (including British), it has laid major, and perhaps disproportionate emphasis on Canadian history in its graduate

program. The Department is aware of this and is making attempts to encourage a more varied mix. In Canadian history, Western has opened up areas for dissertation work that have not been done elsewhere, notably in immigration history, in certain aspects of labour history, in aspects of Indian Affairs, as well as in areas of the local history of Western Ontario. Western has the longest tradition in the Province of collecting documents concerned with local history. There is also an excellent collection of American as well as British materials available, and more students could certainly be attracted to work in these areas. As we point out in para. 33, Western, like York, seems disinclined to make use of its varied resources. We must stress, however, that Western offers instruction of high quality. What we said in para. 44 bears repeating here: "Western has, in one way, a remarkable record: in charge of only one-twentieth of Ph.D. students it has over five years awarded not far short of one-fifth of Ph.D. degrees. This is the sort of efficiency that counts."

McMaster has done remarkably well, considering the rather small size of the Department. (See para. 15.) Its doctoral program is limited to the areas of Ancient, British, and Canadian History. In Ancient History the Department relied perhaps overly much on the presence of Dr. Togo Salmon, who will shortly retire. But the traditions he has established seem so well rooted as to ensure their survival. The work done in British and Canadian history has both

depth and strength. The success of the Department is due to the fact that it deploys its manpower well (see para. 16), that it draws heavily on the support of sister departments, and that it limits the range of its program. In such aspects of Canadian history as the relations between politics and religion in Ontario, in the work now done on demographic problems of Ontario, and in the emphasis on local Ontario history, the Department is able to make an excellent contribution to the discipline. McMaster also has the means for offering an interdisciplinary program in English history and society. (See para. 159, 160.) Indeed, "the materials for an intensive program in English history from the middle ages onwards exist at Western, Guelph and McMaster (possibly with Waterloo), if all were to work together." (See para. 161.)

The Ph.D. program at Guelph is deliberately limited to no more than 15 students at any one time (see para. 138), and the areas in which Ph.D. dissertation work can be done are restricted to certain aspects of Canadian and British history. In Canadian history the Department has concentrated on intellectual and social movements, and on rural settlement and development in Ontario, and it has a strong interest also in the history of education in the Province. In British history, there has been a strong emphasis on Scotland and Ireland in both their domestic and their external spheres. In the fields in which the Department specializes it has developed real strength at the senior professorial level. We were

concerned by the fact that several of the senior historians are near retirement, and we raised this issue both with members of the Department and with the senior officers of the University. There is a strong commitment in the University to see the program continue, and we were assured that the replacements for the retiring professors will be at senior levels, so that the continuity of studies in the areas now well-established at Guelph will be assured.

The Department has been very active in seeking out the co-operation of members of other departments in the University (see para. 29, 103), as well as in the establishment of the interdisciplinary Committee on Scottish Studies, which links History, English, Philosophy and Sociology. (See para. 108.) There is also active co-operation in the area of Reformation history through the consortium that has been established between the universities of Guelph and Waterloo. (See para. 116.)

To sum up: While it might indeed be possible to phase out the Ph.D. programs *in the smaller* departments, we came to the conclusion that such a course of action would be inadvisable. The small departments do in fact make a distinctive, and in some cases a unique, contribution to historical studies in Ontario. No conceivable benefit would compensate for the loss that would be suffered if the small programs were to be discontinued. (See para. 101, 151.)

We do, of course, recommend as much co-operation between departments as is possible. (See particularly para. 161.) As we note in the Report, and show again in this addendum, a good deal of co-operation, particularly between the smaller universities, has already been established. More should be encouraged. But such co-operation works best when it is undertaken voluntarily. Forced marriages rarely work. Finally, we remain convinced that when a Department undertakes to do advanced dissertation work, the effects on the overall scholarly life of the Department are beneficial and profound. To discontinue such work where it already exists would therefore be a retrograde step.

We must note also that our emphasis on the importance that advanced work has for the health of Departments has been generally misunderstood. We were not concerned to make life pleasanter or more stimulating for the faculty alone; it is our opinion, based on extensive experience, that the teaching quality of a Department at undergraduate level declines notably if all it does is teach undergraduates.

Some other comments

Since we are submitting this addendum, we might perhaps be allowed to comment on some of the responses raised by some of the departments and by the History Discipline Group.

One of our main recommendations had to do with the length

of the Ph.D. program and how it might be shortened. There seems to be general agreement that a problem exists, and the Discipline Group agrees "that every effort should be made to shorten the time it takes to complete the degree." They have, however, strong reservations regarding the detailed proposals made in the brief. That is perhaps understandable. We do not pretend that our attempts to find a solution to a problem everyone acknowledges to be a real one must necessarily be accepted in their totality, but the responses seem to indicate that the departments are not inclined to propose alternative solutions. The result must be that the status quo is likely to be preserved. The Discipline Group feels that if all the recommendations in our Report were to be adopted, "the diversity and plurality of approaches....would be restrained." We would indeed have been satisfied if we had found a diversity and plurality of approaches in the preliminary preparation of a Ph.D. student. We found diversity and plurality in the approcaches taken to research and dissertation work, but only Waterloo is attempting to introduce some novel approaches in the pre-dissertation stage of a student's work.

We do believe that a short thesis (no longer than 100 pages) should form part of the requirements for the M.A. (see para. 74), but we realized that this proposal would encounter opposition.

Contrary to some of the interpretations that have been placed on our Report, we are not against part-time study for the

M.A. On the contrary, we recognize the need for such study, particularly for school teachers, who wish to improve their qualifications, and for persons in employment who want to follow a serious personal interest. (See para. 64, 152.)

We are perfectly aware that all Ph.D. programs require a period of residence, usually two years, but since most of that time is taken up with preliminary preparations, many Ph.D. candidates become part-time students when they begin intensive work on their dissertations. (See para. 94.) It is this situation that our recommendations are designed to correct.

The errors of fact alleged by Queen's pose a puzzle. The statements in the Report were based on the information supplied by the Department. However, it looks as though the Department are confused: we were concerned with areas of history in which they are willing to supervise Ph.D. dissertations, whereas they are now listing such areas as they are willing to offer for course and field work.

Finally, in some of the responses there were hints that admission standards for some of the Ph.D. programs were not up to par, but that the consultants had glossed over this situation. In fact, one of us spent about two hours in each university discussing admission standards with departmental representatives and examining a cross-section of applications from candidates who had been admitted as well as from those who had been rejected. In

addition, the files of students who are now going through the various programs as well as those of students who have completed their work were also examined. Unless departments set out deliberately to deceive us, we must stand by our observation that admission standards to Ph.D. programs in History are uniformly high.

July 9, 1974.